This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BR
1
.C54

THE

1997

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

VOLUME XXXIX.

FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME IV.

JULY, SEPTEMBER, NOVEMBER, 1845.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CROSBY.
NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO.
LONDON: JOHN CHAPMAN, 121 NEWGATE ST.
1845.

Andrews, Prentiss & Studley, Printers,
11 Devonshire Street.

CONTENTS.

Article		Page
I.	HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT,	1
	Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschictlichen Entwicklung von der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste. Von Dr. F. C. Baur.	
II.	IMMORTALITY,	23
III.	CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH AND HER WRITINGS,	28
	1. Personal Recollections. By Charlotte Elizabeth.	
	2. Principalities and Powers in Heavenly Places, etc. etc. By Charlotte Elizabeth.	
IV.	CHRISTIAN PEACE, OR CHRISTIAN UNION?	53
V.	SOCIAL INEQUALITIES,	63
	1. The Perils of the Nation.	
	2. Remedies suggested for some of the Evils which constitute the Perils of the Nation.	
VI.	RIGHTS, CLAIMS, AND DUTIES OF OPINION,	82
	[An Address delivered before the Berry Street Ministerial Conference.]	
VII.	CHURCH MUSIC,	102
VIII.	RELATION BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS,	116
	A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha. By Patrick, Lowth, Arnald, Whitby and Lowman.	
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.		
	Vinet's Vital Christianity: Essays and Discourses on the Religions of Man and the Religion of God,	130
	Child's Letters from New York, Second Series,	131
	A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for the Sanctuary,—Christian Hymns for Public and Private Worship,	132
	A Scripture Catechism; containing the Principles of the Christian Religion, stated in the Words of the Bible,	133
	Rejoinder to the "Reply" of Hon. Horace Mann to the "Remarks" of the Association of Boston Masters,	133

Page

Fox's Allegories and Christian Lessons,—Hebrew Tales,—Ella Herbert; or Self-Denial,—Sedgewick's Moral Tales, for Young People,—Martineau's Five Years of Youth; of Sense and Sentiment, - - - - - - - - - - 134

INTELLIGENCE.

Religious Intelligence.—Ecclesiastical Record,—The Anniversaries,—American Unitarian Association,—The Collation,—Berry Street Ministerial Conference,—Sunday School Society,—Clerical Meeting on Slavery,—Administration of the Lord's Supper—Prayer and Conference Meetings—Other Anniversary Meetings,—Ordinations and Installations,—Dedication, - - - - - - - 135

Obituary.—Hon. Leverett Saltonstall,—Rev. Edward H. Edes, - - - - - - - - - - 143

CONTENTS.

Article		Page
I.	Strauss's Life of Jesus — The Mythic Theory,	145
	1. Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet. Von David Friedrich Strauss.	
	2. Voices of the Church in Reply to Dr. D. F. Strauss. Edited by Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D.	
II.	Morison's Life of Smith,	170
	Life of the Hon. Jeremiah Smith, LL. D., Member of Congress during Washington's Administration, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, Chief Justice of New Hampshire, etc. By John H. Morison.	
III.	Rose's Translation of Neander,	180
	The History of the Christian Religion and Church during the three first Centuries. By Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the German by Henry John Rose, B. D.	
IV.	Poetical Contributions,	191
	No Heart Alone, — Retranslation, — Life.	
V.	Blanco White — Rationalism,	195
	The Life of Rev. Joseph Blanco White, written by Himself, with portions of his Correspondence. Edited by John Hamilton Thom.	
VI.	Schaf on Protestantism,	220
	The Principle of Protestantism as related to the Present State of the Church. By Philip Schaf, Ph. D. Translated from the German, with an Introduction, by John W. Nevin, D. D.	
VII.	Poets and Poetry of Europe,	225
	The Poets and Poetry of Europe. By Henry W. Longfellow.	
VIII.	The Moral Character of Christ,	236
IX.	Memoir of Bishop Griswold,	248
	Memoir of the Life of the Rt. Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Eastern Diocese. By John S. Stone, D. D.	

Article		Page
X.	—Harvard College — Sectarianism, - - -	261
	Speech of Josiah Quincy, President of Harvard University, before the Board of Overseers of that Institution, February 25, 1845, on the Minority Report of the Committee of Visitation, presented to that Board by George Bancroft, Esq., February 6, 1845.	
Notices of Recent Publications.		
	Sparks's Library of American Biography, Vol. vi.,	273
	Bush's Soul: or Inquiry into Scriptural Psychology,	274
	Paige's Commentary on New Testament, Vol. ii., -	275
	Miles's Lowell as it was, and as it is,—Mind among the Spindles, — Scoresby's American Factories and their Female Operatives, - - - -	275
	Downing's Fruits and Fruit Trees of America, -	276
	Wilson's Character and Influence of Satan, - -	277
	Lane's Treatise on the Voice, - - - -	277
	Mann's Answer to "Rejoinder," - - - -	277
	Edes's Re-Dedication Discourse at Bolton,—Park's Dudleian Lecture,—Brazer's Discourse on Hon. L. Saltonstall,—Weiss's Discourse on Private and Public Stewardship, - - - - - - -	278
Intelligence.		
	Religious Intelligence. — Ecclesiastical Record, — Cambridge Divinity School, — Meadville Theological School, — Other Denominations, — The Romish Church, — British and Foreign Unitarian Association, — Installations and Ordination, -	279

CONTENTS.

Article		Page
I.	Plea for Theology, - - - - - - - - An Address delivered before the Association of the Alumni of the Cambridge Theological School. By Alvan Lamson.	289
II.	The Fine Arts in America, - - - - - Essays on Art, by Goethe. Translated by Samuel Gray Ward.	314
III.	Poetical Contributions, - - - - - - - The Frost,—The Funeral Bell; A Parable,—Alexander's Power,—Al-Sirat.	331
IV.	Speculative and Practical Wisdom, - - -	337
V.	Life of Blanco White, - - - - - - The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, written by Himself, with Portions of his Correspondence. Edited by John Hamilton Thom.	352
VI.	Festus, - - - - - - - - - - - - Festus. A Poem. By Philip James Bailey.	365
VII.	Rev. Jonathan Farr, - - - - - - - -	379
VIII.	Mrs. Dana's Letters, - - - - - - - Letters addressed to Relatives and Friends, chiefly in Reply to Arguments in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Mary S. B. Dana.	389
IX.	Sumner's Oration, - - - - - - - - The True Grandeur of Nations: an Oration delivered before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4, 1845. By Charles Sumner.	407
Notices of Recent Publications.		
	Margaret, a Tale, - - - - - - - -	418
	Morning and Evening Meditations, - - -	420
	Butler's Horæ Biblicæ, - - - - - -	421
	Burnap's Miscellaneous Writings, - - -	421
	Harris's Epitaphs, - - - - - - - -	421

Article Page

Russell's Young Ladies' Elocutionary Reader,—Russell's Introduction to Young Ladies' Reader, - 422

Gannett's Dedication Discourse,—Robbins's Address and Dedication Sermon,—Ellis's Dedication Discourse,—Peabody's Divinity School Address,—Newell's Discourse on Judge Story,—Greenleaf's Commemorative Discourse,—Baylies's Eulogy on B. Russell,—Peabody's Phi Beta Kappa Oration,—Brooks's Phi Beta Kappa Poem,—Jay's Peace Address,—May's Emancipation Address,—Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery,—Hazard's Essay on Channing,—Quincy's Memoir of Grahame,—Allen's Inquiry,—Brooks's Address on Natural History,—Answer to Questions addressed to Rev. T. Parker,—Answers to Questions contained in Mr. Parker's Letter, - - - - - - 423

INTELLIGENCE.

Religious Intelligence. — Ecclesiastical Record,—Installations and Ordinations,—Dedications, - - 427

Literary Intelligence. — Harvard University, — New Works, - - - - - - - - - - 429

Obituary. — Rev. James Blodgett, — Hon. Joseph Story, - - - - - - - - - - 431

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JULY, 1845.

Art. I. — HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.*

We have placed below, the title of a book, published some years ago by Professor Baur of Tübingen, which contains much the most thorough account we have ever seen of the doctrine of the Atonement, in its historical progress through the Christian Church from the days of Origen and Irenæus to those of Hegel and Marheineke. It is a book not to be read cursorily, and it is one which will reward a close and patient study. Baur is a man of great learning, and much theological acuteness, as his Histories of Christian Gnosticism† and of the Trinity and Incarnation‡ amply show. He is tinctured with the philosophy of Hegel, but

* *Die Christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklun gvon der ältesten Zeit bis auf die neueste.* Von Dr. F. C. Baur, ordentlichem Professor der Evang. Theologie an der Universität zu Tübingen. 1838. 8vo. pp. 764.

The Christian Doctrine of the Atonement according to its historical development. By Dr. F. C. Baur, Professor, etc. in the University at Tübingen.

† *Die Christliche Gnosis, etc.* Tübingen. 1835. pp. 755.

‡ In three large volumes, published in 1841—1844.

his philosophical and theological views seem not to influence him unfavorably as a historian. We might read his book through, and not discover, till we have reached the last few pages, to what opinion the writer inclines, so impartially does he present the arguments for the highest form of church Orthodoxy and for the lowest form of Rationalism. And yet the book is not a mere statement of the views and arguments of different ages and sects, without arrangement, progress or unity. It is critical and philosophical as well as historical. Its peculiar merit is that it contemplates the different views concerning this doctrine in relation to a law of progress, and attempts to show a gradual but regular development of the doctrine, from the first theoretical statement of it to the present time. Baur objects strongly to those histories which only heap together facts, only give an aggregate of opinions, without that binding coherence which is the soul of history. The history of a doctrine, he thinks, should show the inner movement of the idea, according to the progress of the human mind; and in a doctrinal history or monograph, the most difficult problem concerns not the facts, but their arrangement.

And certainly, if we believe that the development of ideas and the progress of thought are not accidental but Providential; if we believe that the human mind is, to some extent at least, under law; if we believe that opinions change from age to age, not according to blind chance but by a Divine guidance; it becomes a deeply interesting inquiry, What is the law of this progress, and toward what does it tend? Every doctrine or opinion which we study with this view, opens to us a new chapter in the Providential history of the human mind. As in the material world, a violent action in one direction produces reaction in the opposite, one extreme generates another to balance and restrain it. The mind acts freely, and yet under certain conditions and limitations from which it can never emancipate itself. This view offers the best consolation amid the apparent vagaries of opinion, and prevents an undue timidity when new and wild speculations arise around us.

To many minds the history of theological doctrines is not an attractive study. It seems frivolous, barren and empty.

The above considerations may make it appear less repulsive, and there are others quite as important. It is not easy to understand a doctrine aright until we make ourselves acquainted with its history. We are surrounded by traditional ideas concerning it, we are inevitably biased by the notions which prevail in our own time. We cannot, by an effort, get away from their influences. We may try to study the Scriptures impartially, and draw our views only from the New Testament, but we read it through a colored medium. The words of the New Testament are tinged, to our minds, by the ideas we have heard attached to them. But by the study of history we get upon a higher ground, where we can see the growth and gradual formation of the doctrines of our own age and church. Studying them in relation to the views of other periods, they assume their due importance in our minds. We are thus enabled to separate the transient form from the permanent substance of the doctrine. We see how every age has clothed it in a dress borrowed from its peculiar forms of thought, and yet that under all there has remained something unchanging and enduring.

There is no doctrine which deserves better to be thus studied by the light of history than that of the Atonement. The idea of Reconciliation is the central point of Christian doctrine, and it may almost be said of all religion, since it contains the thought on which the necessity of religion is based, — that of man's separation from God, and union with God.

Unitarians have not sufficiently understood the meaning of this doctrine. They have justly rejected the Orthodox form of it, and have exposed, by irresistible arguments, the fallacies on which it rests, and the inconsistencies in which it is involved. But they have not as yet adequately replaced this form of doctrine by any other. Here, as elsewhere, they have done more in the polemical than in the dogmatical department of theology. Their criticism has been excellent, their positive teaching not so good. Their views, as hitherto presented, do not, we believe, sufficiently explain two important phenomena; first, the great stress laid in the New Testament upon the work of Christ, in its relation to the forgiveness of sin; and second, the importance assigned to this doctrine by the Christian Church and

by Christian experience in all ages. These two facts must be adequately accounted for by any theory of the Atonement which is expected to maintain its place as a permanent solution of this question. That Unitarian theology has not yet done justice to this doctrine is not brought as a reproach against it. It has had its own work to do, and this has hitherto been one rather of destruction than of construction. But now, this work is well-nigh done, and everywhere men are beginning to build. We may now hope to have a more positive system of theology, and with the rest, more justice will be done to the positive side of the doctrine of Atonement. Meantime, we may help to prepare for this, by taking a brief survey of the past history of the doctrine. In doing this we shall make free use of the work of Professor Baur, and of the other helps within our reach. Our survey must be very cursory, for our limits compel us, however reluctantly, to abstain from touching any but the most prominent points.

In surveying the course of this doctrine we are struck by three periods, distinctly marked, which present themselves immediately to our observation.* The first, which may be called the Mythic period, extends from an early point of Christian antiquity to the eleventh century, during a period of nearly a thousand years. During the whole of this time, the prevailing idea was of a controversy between Christ and the devil for the souls of men, and the work of Christ was mainly to redeem men from the power of the devil, by paying the ransom due to him on account of their sins. The second is the Scholastic period, extending from the eleventh century to the Reformation, and during this period the leading notion was *legal*, and the work of Christ was to satisfy the justice of God by paying the debt legally incurred by the sinner. The third is the period from the Reformation to the present time, and the leading thought has relation to the *government* of God, the work of Christ being mainly to produce an impression on the human mind, by manifesting God's hatred of sin, his respect for his law, or his forgiving love.

* Baur makes a different division. According to him the History of the Doctrine is divided into Periods, and these again are subdivided. His object is scholastic precision; ours, to give a clear general view of the subject.

Throughout the whole of this time we see that the doctrine is in progress. It passes from the most theoretical to the most practical form. The work of Christ is at first something wholly outward, out of men, out of the world; it is at last wholly inward, a work taking place in the interior soul. It is at first objective, it is finally subjective. Atonement is at first a transaction between God and Satan, in the supernatural world; then it becomes a transaction between God and man, in which God is to be satisfied; and then an influence exercised upon the human mind by which man is to be redeemed. But after reaching this extreme point of subjectivity, a reaction takes place, and in the systems which have followed from the philosophy of Kant, Schelling and Hegel, there has been an attempt to combine the objective and subjective forms; in other words, to represent the atonement as a transaction in which God is reconciled to man, as well as man reconciled to God.

Returning therefore to the first period, which we have called the *mythic* period of the doctrine, we shall see that the writers of the early church, taking a partial view of the New Testament statements concerning the work of Christ, and seizing on a particular class of Scripture expressions, constructed a theory in accordance with the habits of thought peculiar to their age.

The New Testament ascribes a great variety of influences to the death of Christ, and uses a multitude of expressions in relation to it. Many of these are highly figurative, as where Christians are said to "wash their robes white in the blood of the Lamb," and many are naturally borrowed from the Jewish ritual and sacrifices. But there are two principal effects, relating to the twofold consequences of sin, as separating us from God and as depraving our nature. The work of Christ, in relation to the first, is called in the New Testament *reconciliation*, in relation to the second, *redemption*. The first removes the guilt of sin, the second its power. By the first we are forgiven, by the second we are cleansed from all unrighteousness. Now the first of these effects was of too inward, subjective and spiritual a character, to suit the tone of thought in the early church. They passed by, therefore, the fact of Reconciliation; and took hold of the fact of

Redemption, as comprising the chief part of the work of Christ. And seizing a single expression of Scripture in relation to this, they built their whole theory on its literal application. The word thus taken as the foundation of their system was the word "*Ransom*," a word used by Christ* of himself, and applied also to his work by the Apostles. "A *ransom*," they argued, "is paid to deliver captives from the hands of their enemies. But if Christ gave his life as a ransom for us, to whom did he give it? It must have been to an enemy who held us captive. And who could this be except the devil?" Thus argued, for example, Irenæus, contending against the Gnostics,† who endeavored to take a more spiritual view of the death of Christ. Irenæus was the first‡ who attempted anything like a doctrinal development of the notion of Redemption. His theory was this. Men, through sin, have become the prisoners of the devil. Christ, being perfectly just, the devil has no just power over him. By causing him to be put to death, the devil therefore made himself liable in turn to a penalty, and Christ accepts the freedom of his prisoners as his due. He, by his death, pays their ransom, and sets them free. This theory was supported by those texts which speak of a victory over the devil.§

Origen supplied the defects in the system of Irenæus, and developed the doctrine further. He is more mythic in his view than Irenæus, for he explains the motives which led the devil to cause the crucifixion of Jesus, a point which

---

* Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. Titus ii. 14. 1 Peter i. 18, etc.

† The Gnostic views of the death of Christ were quite different from each other. Thus Basilides admitted a real death of Jesus, but only of the *man* Jesus, and denied the power of his death to redeem others. Marcion taught that the sufferings of Jesus were to be regarded as those of the Divine Being, but were not to be considered as real, but only symbolic, representing the truth that man must die to this world and to all material things. Valentine said that the Psychic Christ, not the Pneumatic, (the soul, not the spirit, the humanity, not the divinity,) suffered on the cross. This, according to him, typified the truth that in the Absolute becoming one with itself, all finite existence is reconciled with it. — *Baur, Christ. Gnosis*, p. 140.

‡ The early Fathers were occupied almost entirely in opposing the Gnostic Docetic tendencies and in proving the *reality* of the death of Jesus. Ignatius, Tertullian, etc. say a great deal of the reconciling power of the death of Jesus, but not definitely enough to give any distinct doctrinal idea. — *Baur, von der Versöhnung*, p. 26.

§ Coloss. ii. 15. Heb. ii. 14. 1 John iii. 8.

Irenæus had left in obscurity. Origen regarded good and evil as in constant conflict, and considered every good action of a good man as a victory gained over evil and the demoniac world. Every martyr-death is a victory. The demons are well aware of this, but blinded by their hatred, forget it, and cause the death of the good. But in doing so they destroy their own power.* Thus was the devil deceived, when, through hatred of the goodness of Jesus, he caused him to be murdered. He was then obliged to accept his soul† as a ransom for sinners. The death of Christ differs from that of other martyrs only in this, that his death brought good to *all* men.

The theory, thus developed by Irenæus and Origen, held its place for many centuries with little alteration. The *right* of the devil over men was fully admitted. Augustine regarded it as the right of property. According to him Adam was conquered by the devil in fair fight and made his slave by the laws of war, and according to the same laws all his descendants were slaves also.‡ Leo the Great

---

* Origen taught that good works magically, by a secret wonderful power, upon evil. He refers those who doubt to the Heathens, who believed that cities and nations had been saved by the voluntary devotion of some heroic characters. Origen also regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice offered to God, and contends that a sin can never be forgiven without a sacrifice. Yet this necessity is not deduced from the notion of divine justice, consequently it contains no idea of *substituted suffering*. The purity of the sacrifice takes away the sin, and in its beauty the evils of men vanish away. The beauty of the sacrifice would lead God to forgive, but the devil's claim remains, and that is satisfied by the soul of Jesus as a ransom. We must not look for perfect consistency in these early fathers.

† The ransom, says Origen, (λύτρον) which Jesus paid for our sins, was not his *spirit*, (πνεῦμα,) for this he committed to the hands of his Father; it was not his *body*, (σῶμα,) for of this Scripture says nothing; it was his *soul*, (ψυχή,) which he gave to the devil. In this three-fold division of man, (technically called *trichotomy*,) he follows an ancient Platonic theory, held by the Gnostics and Cabbalists, and revived in modern times by Olshausen, who thinks it asserted by Paul, 1 Thess. v. 25. It is curious that the somnambulists make the same distinction. (See *Scherin von Prevorst*, Werner's *Schutzgeister*, etc.) Origen says, (we quote from *Bretschneider's Dogmatic*, 2d vol. p. 302,) "Si ergo, (according to 1 Peter i. 18,) pretio emti sumus, ab aliquo sine dubio emti sumus, cujus servi eramus, qui et pretium poposcit, quod voluit, ut de potestate dimitteret, quos tenebat. Tenebat autem nos diabolus; poposcit ergo pretium nostrum sanguinem Christi."

‡ Augustine wavers in his view, and in some places seems to take an opposite one.

considered the devil to have only a tyrannical right. Others thought man to be only in the power of the devil. Some, as Theodoret and Hilary of Poictiers, spoke of redemption as a battle, in which Christ has conquered the devil, and set free his prisoners. The notion of a *contract*, however, was more usual, and it was accurately explained how the devil was deceived into accepting the life of Christ as a ransom. Gregory of Nyssa tells us that he was attracted by the sublimity of Christ's works, and did not perceive the divinity under the veil of the flesh. "Under the bait of the flesh," he says, "the hook of the divinity was concealed." This figure of the hook and bait runs through many of the Fathers down to Peter Lombard.

Objections were made to this view, from time to time, by one and another, and even those who held it seem often inconsistent with themselves in their statements. It was opposed by Gregory Nazianzen, John Damascene and others. But it had taken such strong hold of the mind of the age, that it continued the prevailing view. And even after it had been rejected by Anselm and Abelard, and its inconsistencies fully pointed out, the famous Orthodox teacher, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, defended it with extreme bitterness against its opposers.* Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, A. D. 1164, whose "Four Books of Sentences" was the text book of every student, and commented upon by every great theologian, holds to a certain right in the devil over the souls of men.† In fact, so long as they clung to the literal idea of redemption, they were compelled to return to the view of an atonement offered to the devil.

The second period is that of *Scholasticism.* But what

---

* Abelard said "Ego vero dico, et ratione irrefragabili probo, quod diabolus in hominem nullum jus habuerit. Neque enim qui eum decipiendo a subjectione domini sui alienavit, aliquam potestatem super eum debuit accipere, potius si quam prius haberet, debuit amittere." But Bernard replied with truly orthodox loftiness of tone, "Discat diabolum non solum potestatem, sed etiam justam habuisse in homines, ut consequenter et hoc videat, venisse utique in carne Dei Filium propter liberandos homines. Diaboli in hominem quoddam jus, etsi non jure acquisitum, sed nequiter usurpatum, juste tamen permissum." These quotations are by Hase, "Evangelische Dogmatic," p. 246, third edition.

† LOMBARD. *Sentences* 3. 9. "Injuste Diabolus, quantum ad se, tenebat hominem, sed homo juste tenebatur, quia diabolus nunquam meruit potestatem habere super hominem, sed homo meruit per culpam pati diaboli tyrannidem."

was scholasticism? Baumgarten Crusius says, "The school separating itself from the Church, and endeavoring to gain an independent existence." Hegel, going deeper, says, "First come the Church Fathers, then the Church Doctors." First come those who give life to the Church, then, life needing light, there arise those who shall teach it.

In the first period of the Church, the direction of its activity was to produce the contents or substance of doctrine; in the second, or scholastic, to give arrangement and form. To systematize and reconcile the various doctrines which had come to be regarded as Orthodox; to harmonize the whole into a complete system of theology; by innumerable distinctions, and the most subtle definitions, to enfold and penetrate every theological question with the sharpest thought; such was the work of the dialectic scholasticism of the middle ages. But at the very beginning of this period appears a book, which was destined, by the power of its author's genius, to make an epoch in theology, and especially in the history of this doctrine.

Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, born 1034; scholar and successor of Lanfranc, the opponent of Berengarius; in his celebrated book, "Cur Deus homo?" lays the foundation of the Church doctrine of substituted punishment. A realist in philosophy, proving the existence of God by assuming the reality of general ideas, in an argument which has been commended by Leibnitz and Hegel; he carries into theology the same strong confidence in necessary truths, and endeavors to found the doctrine of the Atonement on a basis of absolute necessity. He sweeps away, with the boldness of an independent thinker, the whole doctrine of the rights of the devil, declaring that the devil has a right to nothing but to be punished.*

Anselm begins his treatise by asking, Why was it necessary that God should become man in order to redeem mankind? His answer is, Because only so could the guilt of sin be atoned for. He defines sin to be, *not giving to God his due.*† But man owes God all that comes within the sphere of his free will. Whenever he omits to pay this debt, he dishonors God, and commits sin. How can satis-

* "Diabolo nec Deus aliquid debebat nisi pœnam."

† "Non aliud peccare, quam Deo non reddere debitum."

faction be made to God for his dishonor? It cannot be made by us, since at any moment we already owe God all that we can do. All that we can do, therefore, only fulfils our present duty, and prevents us from falling into new sin, but cannot satisfy for past sin. Since the gift of a universe ought not to tempt us to omit a single duty, it is evident that each duty outweighs the universe, and for each omission of duty we owe to God more than a universe. Evidently, therefore, we cannot ourselves satisfy God for our past sin. But satisfaction must be made, or punishment inflicted; for only by punishing sin, or receiving satisfaction for sin, can God's honor be maintained. That it ought to be maintained is evident; since as there is nothing in the universe greater or better than God, to maintain God's honor is most just, and the best thing for the whole universe. If God were to forgive sin without satisfaction being made for it, it would be a disorder in his kingdom. Sin, in that case, being subject to no law, would enjoy greater freedom than goodness. Now, as God's honor can be preserved in two ways, either by punishing sin, or receiving satisfaction for it, why does God choose satisfaction instead of punishment? Anselm gives two reasons, first, because so sublime a work as man's rational nature should not be created in vain, or suffered to perish; second, because the number of the redeemed being absolutely fixed, and some of the angels having fallen, their number must be supplied from among men. Man must, therefore, be enabled to satisfy God for his sin, in order that he may be saved. But to satisfy God, we have seen that he must give God more than the universe, that is, more than all that is not God. But only God himself is this — therefore God himself must make the satisfaction. But it is man who owes the debt, therefore God must be man to make satisfaction. Hence the necessity of the Incarnation of the Son of God, or of the God-man. To make satisfaction, this God-man must pay something which he does not himself owe on his own account. As a man he owes perfect obedience for himself; this then cannot be the satisfaction. But being a sinless man, he is not bound to die; his death, therefore, as the death of a God-man, is the adequate and proper satisfaction. In return for so great a gift, the Father bestows what the Son desires,

namely, human redemption. These are the essential steps of the famous argument of Anselm.*

Many serious objections may be urged against this theory, and the same scholastic acuteness which Anselm showed in building it up was manifested by other scholastic Doctors in criticising it. Their minds were too penetrating not to discover its main defect; namely, that the idea on which it is based, of the absolute preponderance of the Divine Justice over the Divine Love, is a mere supposition. Peter Abelard, born 1079, the great Rationalist of the middle ages, criticises and opposes it in his Commentary on Romans. He places the reconciling power of the death of Jesus in its awakening in us an answering love, which conquers our sinfulness. Those who foresaw this revelation of the goodness of God were influenced by it also.† Robert Pullen, teacher at Oxford, 1130, agrees with Abelard. So also, on the whole, do Peter Lombard and Hugo St. Victor.

With Peter Lombard begins the period of Summists, or system-making Doctors. Their object was totality. They attempted to give a solution to every theological question which could be asked. Their usual course is to state the question, then adduce the arguments from Scripture and the Fathers in favor of each side, then the conclusion, in which they endeavor to find a way of reconciling the opposite views. On these great theologians, overrated once, underrated now, we would gladly dwell, did our limits permit. Bonaventura, the Seraphic Doctor, (born 1221) handles this subject with great clearness and simplicity. He almost adopts Anselm's theory, and then lets it fall by denying the absolute necessity of satisfaction. God, he says, being omnipotent, might have chosen some other

* It will be seen that, according to Anselm, Christ's death was not *vicarious punishment*. He did not endure punishment in the place of sinners. On the contrary, the idea of *satisfaction* excludes that of *punishment*. God is satisfied *either* by satisfaction *or* punishment. "Necesse est ut omne peccatum satisfactio *aut* pœna sequatur." The death of Christ satisfies God's holiness, because it was a free act of goodness which was equal to all the good acts which men had omitted to perform. The notion of vicarious *punishment* was introduced afterward by the Lutheran Reformers, when they distinguished between the active and passive obedience of Christ.

† In proof of which he quotes the text, "The multitudes which *went before*, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David."

way. But when the reason has seen a thing to be necessary, it is absurd to place above this necessity the abstract notion of an Omnipotence which may make it unnecessary. For in this case, the notion really uppermost is that of the entire incomprehensibility of God, which of course overthrows every theory founded on a supposed knowledge of his attributes.

The theory of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, (born 1224) is chiefly distinguished by its doctrine of "satisfactio superabundans." Christ has restored to God *more* than was taken from him by human sin. This surplus became afterward a stock of merit belonging to the church, and was the ground on which it based the right of selling indulgences. In the main Aquinas agrees with Anselm, nevertheless he also gives up the absolute necessity of satisfaction.

Opposed to St. Thomas stands Duns Scotus, (flourished 1300) the Subtle Doctor, whose view directly contradicts that of Anselm. He denies the infinite guilt of sin and the infinite merit of Christ, declaring that guilt and merit take their character from their subject not their object. He declares that the belief of the infinite character of sin, involves Manicheism. Sin, however, though not *intensively* infinite (in itself) is *extensively* so (in its results.) By thus denying the infinite nature of sin Anselm's theory is cut up by the roots. He denies the necessity of the death of Christ, and even asserts that it is possible that a mere man might have atoned for us. Anything which God chose to *accept* as an atonement would be so. In other words God's *will* is not conditioned by any necessity, but is absolutely supreme. And here is the radical difference between the Scotists and Thomists, the one attributing to God an unconditioned will, the other a will conditioned by the laws of his nature. From this point the scholastics divided into these two parties, though the majority were Scotists. The church however decided for the doctrine of Thomas, as seeming most to favor church authority. It was adopted by the Bull *Unigenitus*. The idea of *acceptatio* is found however in a great variety of systems, from the time of Scotus down.

And now we come to the third great epoch in the history of our doctrine, which commences with the Reformation.

The peculiarity of the Protestant Reformation, as of all true reformations, consists in its being a falling back upon personal experience. Wearied with the forms of Scholasticism, men were impelled to reject everything which was not based in a moral need, or an immediate and practical religious interest. The Reformation therefore was the great turning point, where the mind passed from the Outward to the Inward, from objectivity to subjectivity, and became conscious of its own freedom. Nothing which could not be legitimated by an inward experience was henceforth to be regarded as true. Hence the importance of Faith, or the deepest personal element in man.

The principal difference between the Lutheran theology and that of Anselm was significant of this change. Anselm's doctrine was based in a necessity of the Divine nature, Luther's in a need of human nature. Anselm asked, How shall God be satisfied? Luther, How shall man be justified?

In answering this question the Lutheran theologians maintained the doctrine of an infinite evil in sin, but changed the *satisfaction* of Anselm into an *equivalent*. They also made the distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ, which was not known to the theory of Anselm. Their view was, that man by disobeying the law of God was justly exposed to punishment, but Christ is punished in his place, and he thus becomes free. Yet he is still bound to obey God and lead a life of perfect goodness in order to be saved. Christ fulfils this obligation for him by his holy life. The suffering he ought to bear, Christ bears; the duty he ought to perform, Christ performs. The satisfaction, therefore, before confined to the death of Christ, is now extended to his life; and now first is Christ considered as being punished in the place of the sinner. God also is now regarded as a sovereign, bound to uphold his laws, instead of a creditor, claiming his due.* We see

* A strong opposition was made to the Lutheran distinction of active and passive obedience by John Piscator, a reformed theologian, at the end of the 16th century. Piscator argued, from the definition of justification in Rom. iv. 6, 7, that the imputation of forgiveness and active obedience are not two parts of Justification, but one and the same. Christ, he maintains, as a man, was bound to obey God on his own account, and his active obedience cannot therefore be credited to us. His obedience in suffering, therefore, was the only cause of our being forgiven. If his ac-

in this the beginning of the change from the legal to the governmental view.*

We now come to Faustus Socinus and the Socinians, whose doctrine may be regarded as the great revolt from the doctrinal authority of the church, as that of Luther was a revolt from its ecclesiastical authority. Socinianism is the extreme of subjectivity. In this system the subject (man) becomes self-dependant, and his relation to the object (God) becomes an outward one. The attacks by Socinus upon the church doctrines, were very acute, and have never been sufficiently met or answered.

The argument of Socinus against the church theory of satisfaction, begins by denying its foundation, the idea of Divine justice. If God cannot forgive sin without a satisfaction, he becomes subject to finite limitations. Mercy is as much an attribute with God as justice, but if we consider it as absolute, then God cannot punish sin at all. Therefore justice and mercy must both be regarded as finite conditions, not absolute qualities in God. Both are effects of his will, which is his absolute essence. Man therefore is reconciled to God, God is not reconciled to man.

With still greater emphasis does the Socinian logic attack the doctrine of satisfaction itself. Satisfaction and

---

tive obedience is imputed to us, God is paid twice for our sins. Again, if his active obedience is imputed to us, we are not bound to obey for ourselves. The Lutherans, in reply, argued that we could only be justified by actual obedience to God's commandments. As no one obeyed these for himself, Christ must obey for us. But Piscator replied, "The law demands punishment or obedience, not both." This controversy forms an important epoch in the history of the doctrine.

* Osiander ought to be mentioned here, who about the year 1550 began in the Protestant Church the opposition to the forensic or declaratory view of the work of Christ, declaring justification to be a real act, conveying holiness to the soul, and forming Christ within us. He says of his opponents, "Omnes horribiliter errant. Primo, quia verbum justificare tantum pro justum reputare et pronuntiare intelligunt, et non pro eo quod est, justum efficere reipsa et veritate." He says a thief is not made just by being pardoned, and saved from the gallows. He calls it blasphemy to say that God declares a man just without making him so, for it is saying that God declares what is not true. Christ's justice consists neither in his action nor passion, but in his nature and being, and we are justified only by being joined to Christ by faith, and having God and Christ dwell within us. This view was afterward taken by Swenkenfeld, Weigel, and other mystical writers in Germany, and by William Law and the Quakers in England. Though a mystical view, it is a highly valuable contribution to theology, and the germ of it is evidently to be found in John and Paul. Calvin, also, regards Christ as not only making satisfaction for sin, but also as communicating to man the essence of God.

forgiveness mutually exclude each other. Satisfaction pays the debt; how then can it be forgiven? If forgiven, why need it be paid? If it be said that the person who owes the debt is forgiven, because it is not demanded of him but of another; Socinus then asks, how can a debt be asked except of the one who owes it or the one who assumes it? If *paid* by either, how can it be forgiven? Moreover, punishment is strictly a personal thing. The idea of punishment involves that of guilt. If transferred to the innocent, it ceases to be punishment. Punishment therefore cannot be assumed like a debt. Again, satisfaction supposes both the justice and the mercy of God in exercise. But the exercise of mercy would be a free pardon, that of justice determined punishment.

As a matter of fact, satisfaction is impossible, and could never have been made. Every sinner deserves eternal death. The substitute then should endure eternal death for every individual sinner, which is impossible. But in fact Christ did not endure it at all, for he rose from the dead in three days, and has ascended into heaven. Paul says that "If Christ be not risen, we are yet in our sins." But if his death freed us from sin, his resurrection is unnecessary. Nor was the death of Christ a punishment, since it was the means of his exaltation and glory. If it be said that Christ made an infinite satisfaction through the dignity of his person, Socinus replies that with God "there is no respect of persons." Christ could not suffer as God, and if he could have done so, this Divine suffering would have been no proper satisfaction for human sin. Nor, lastly, could God make satisfaction to himself.

Nor did it escape the acuteness of Faustus Socinus, that active and passive obedience are contradictory to each other. The one either excludes the other, or makes it unnecessary. Christ could not make satisfaction by his active obedience, for he was bound to obey God on his own account. His obedience was rewarded by his own elevation to glory, it could not therefore have been rewarded by the salvation of others. Nor could the obedience of one have made satisfaction for that due by all. However exalted his person, he could only do, what each owes, i. e. obey God perfectly.

In addition to these arguments, Socinus adduced others

founded on the nature of man, which we cannot stop to insert here. This bold and profound attack was met by a sufficiently tame reply from the Protestant theologians. They merely repeated again their previous formulas, and relied mainly on the Scripture argument. But here again they were met by their skilful opponents by a mode of interpretation, which Baur says was original with Socinus, and which has never been sufficiently carried out since his time. Socinus collected all the texts referring to the death of Christ or to the forgiveness of sin, and arranged them in four classes. Placing in the first class the texts which speak of Christ's death as a ransom or redemption, he easily showed that these were to be taken figuratively. In the second class were those which spoke of Christ as dying for our sins, which he explained as meaning that he died on account of our sins, and in order that we might be freed from them. The third class of texts included those in which it is said that Christ took our sins on himself, or took them away. These either mean that he has taken them away by making us good, or borne them, as one may bear the consequences of another's sin. The fourth class include the texts relating to Jewish types and sacrifices. Here Socinus clearly shows that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were not substitutions, either really or symbolically, but only certain conditions with which God had connected the forgiveness of sin.

Having thus demolished the church doctrine of atonement, what did Socinus put in its place? The positive side of his system is far from being as satisfactory as the negative. The sum of it is briefly this.

Man is reconciled to God when he repents. God is always placable, man alone needs to be changed. He reconciles himself by repenting. Repentance in the system of Socinus takes the place which faith occupies in the Protestant system. Still, subjective as this system appears, it has also an objectivity of its own. If faith has its object out of itself in the Divine love, repentance has its object out of itself in the Divine law. Socinus also teaches that it is faith in God's forgiveness which leads to repentance. Faith is necessary also, therefore in his system. The question between Socinus and Luther is only this, Do we repent in order to be forgiven, or are we forgiven in order that we may repent?

But how is Christ a Redeemer according to Socinus? Through Christ man has God's promise to trust and God's law to obey. He is reconciled to God when he has a practical living confidence that his sins are forgiven. Christ gives him this confidence by announcing forgiveness on the condition of repentance. Christ's office therefore as a Mediator is prophetic rather than priestly. The death of Christ has value as an example of self-sacrifice and as a solemn confirmation and seal of the promises of God. The death and resurrection of Christ are necessary to man's salvation, but not because of any effect they exercise upon God, but because of their moral influence upon man.

This attack by Socinus made it necessary for the system of church orthodoxy to shift its ground, that which it had occupied having become no longer tenable. Hence the famous theory of Hugo Grotius, which has been essentially that of modern orthodoxy ever since his time. He founds the necessity of Christ's death not on the justice of God as a creditor, but as a ruler, ("justitia Dei rectoria.") For the legal view of the atonement, he substitutes a Governmental view.*

The fundamental error of Socinus, says Grotius, is to consider God in the work of redemption only in the light of a creditor, who may forgive the debt if he will; or in that of an absolute monarch, who can at any time remit punishment. God is to be regarded as a Governor, and the right of forgiveness is conditioned by the good of the whole community. The object of punishment is not to satisfy the honor of the monarch only, but also to preserve the order and protect the peace of society. Atonement is an act of Jurisdiction, according to which one is punished that another may be excused; or of Dispensation, remitting the operation of the law with respect to certain persons or matters. Now, can the law of punishment be relaxed? All positive laws, says Grotius, may be relaxed. The law (Genesis ii. 17) which announces death for disobedience, may be remitted, since it is an expression, not of the Divine nature but of the Divine will. But in order that it might safely be remitted in the case of human beings, it was

* The title of the work of Grotius, which was published in 1617, is "Defensio fidei Catholicæ de Satisfactione Christi." But instead of defending the orthodox theory he substitutes another in its place.

necessary that some example should be made to show the evil of sin. Christ, therefore, "died for our sins," to be an example of God's displeasure against sin. This displeasure the Scripture calls "the wrath of God." In the death of Christ therefore, God's hatred of sin, his care for his law, and his goodness to men are all manifested.*

The essence of the theory of Grotius lies in the proposition, "God could not forgive sin without an act of exemplary punishment." The necessity of Christ's death therefore, according to this theory is very different from its necessity in the theory of Anselm. It has reference not to the past but to the future. The guilt of past sins is abolished by an immediate act of Divine love, the example of punishment is only necessary to prevent future sin. Therefore, with Grotius, as with Socinus, the principal effect of the death of Christ is its *moral influence* on man. With Grotius this is negative, with Socinus positive. According to Grotius Christ's death was necessary before man could be forgiven, but this is also the case in the theory of Socinus. In some respects Grotius is the least consequent of the two. Anselm's theory is based on the notion of Divine justice, that of Socinus on the notion of Divine goodness. Grotius, in his theory, neutralises both. The whole of this theory has the character of a juridical proceeding, and its error consists in applying to the Divine law and government necessities which belong merely to human governments and human laws.

The essential difference between the theory of Grotius, and the church doctrine of satisfaction is very apparent. The main point of the church theory is this, that before man can be forgiven Divine justice demands that the *full debt* be paid. Satisfaction is paying to God the very debt which man owes, and what Christ has done is identical with what man ought to do. Socinus objected to this, that it made forgiveness impossible, and that therefore satisfaction and forgiveness are contradictory. Grotius replies that Christ's death is not "satisfactio" but "solutio;" that is to say, the debt is not paid, but something is

* According to the Jurists, says Grotius, the best kind of Relaxation of Law, is by a *commutatio* or a *compensatio*. In this way both the *dignity* of the law and its *purpose* are secured. "Proxima enim sunt idem et tantumdem."

accepted in the place of it, and this act of accepting Christ's death constitutes forgiveness. He admits that if the full and very debt was paid by the death of Christ, "remissio,' or freedom from guilt would follow at once, without any forgiveness on the part of God. The death of Christ would then be in itself "solutio" or payment, and call not for an act of "remissio" or pardon on the part of God, but of "liberatio" or acquittal. He thus virtually surrenders to Socinus the theory he had undertaken to defend against him.

Crellius, the Socinian, replied to Grotius, (Fratres Poloni, vol. 5,) and easily showed the injustice he had done to Socinus and the defects of his theory. These defects were also observed by his own friends, the Arminians.* Nevertheless the theory of Grotius has, on the whole, continued to be the most favorite form of modern orthodoxy down to the present time.

We must stop our historical survey at this point, and content ourselves with a few closing remarks suggested by this cursory view of the subject.

1. In tracing the history of this doctrine, we have seen that it divides itself into three distinct periods, in each of which a different idea has characterised the prevailing and orthodox theory. During the first and largest of these periods, this leading idea was of a conflict between good and evil, and the death of Christ was a ransom paid to the powers of darkness to redeem men from their dominion. During the second period, the main thought is of a debt which the sinner owes to God, which it is impossible for him to pay except by the aid of Christ. And in the third period, the notion which gives its character to the doctrine is that of a Government, and a necessity of state which makes it impossible to forgive sin, except by such a display of the indignation of God, as will prevent the evil consequences which might otherwise occur. According to each theory, Christ dies to satisfy Divine justice; but in the first, this justice has reference to the rights and lawful claims of

* Episcopius pointed out to him the deficiency of his theory on the objective side, in a treatise which he sent him in manuscript, asking at the same time the question, "An Christus morte suâ aliquid *circa Deum* effecerit?" Limborch also attempts to find a better medium between the church doctrine and that of the Socinians, by developing the idea of the death of Christ as a *sacrifice*, really offered to God.

the devil; in the second, to the rights and honor of God himself; in the third, to the order of the universe, and the claims of God's creatures. There is also a necessity for Christ's death according to each theory; but in the first, this necessity is founded on God's supposed relations to the supernatural world; in the second, on his relations to himself; in the third, on his relations to his creatures. Each of the theories implies a limitation of the Divine attributes. In the first, the Divine power is limited by the opposing power of evil, which is a dualistic view allied to Manicheism; in the second, the Divine goodness is limited by the demands of the Divine justice, which implies a conflict in the Divine Mind; in the third, the Divine wisdom is limited by difficulties inherent in the government of free beings.

2. We have before remarked that the direction taken by the theory of the atonement during each period seemed determined in some degree by the prevailing ideas of the time, and the tendency of the age. The first theory was warlike, the second legal, the third governmental. It was natural during those terrible centuries in which the church was exposed to so many forms of outward evil, that the theory of redemption should assume the form of a conflict with outward evil and a victory over the Prince of darkness. It was an age in which persecutions tormented the Christian church, in which the Emperors of the world seemed to rival the Evil One in atrocious wickedness; in which the legions of the empire bound with their iron chain the whole earth in military subjection. Then came the dreadful inroads of the barbarians, the destructive famines, and awful pestilences which were thought to have consumed in a few years half of the human race throughout the civilised world. What wonder that redemption from outward evil and sin should seem to be the chief work of Christ, and the passages of Scripture which indicate a conflict with evil be taken as the basis of the theory of redemption?

But when a thousand years had passed, these tumults had gone by. The barbarous nations, having conquered every part of the Roman empire, had been converted to Christianity, and became fixed in their new homes. The tide of Mahommedan conquest, checked at the Pyrenees, had begun permanently to recede before the deeper life of

Christendom. The conquerors of Rome, feeling their want of better institutions, accepted her splendid codes of laws and began to modify and apply them to their own needs. Hence the study of Roman Law sprang up suddenly in the twelfth century, and appeared in new glory. Thousands of students crowded the universities, attracted by the fame of great jurists. We read of the celebrity of the University of Bologna, and of the Four Doctors. The civil and canon law were taught together at all the ecclesiastical establishments. Many distinguished scholastic theologians were also eminent as writers on civil law, and among them Lanfranc, the teacher of Anselm. Just at this time appeared the new theory of the atonement. Is it surprising that it should partake of the character of thought belonging to this time, and be founded not on warlike but *legal* ideas, on the rights of property and persons, on the notion of debt and payment, on a wrong done to God's honor by sin, for which a full recompense was to be demanded? Those passages of Scripture in which sin is spoken of as an injury inflicted on the Divine character, and the work of Christ as freeing us from the debt incurred by disobedience, were now made the basis of the doctrine.

With the Reformation came new ideas of human rights in civil as well as in ecclesiastical affairs. Reform in the church prepared the way for reform in politics, and men now began to ask for what purpose was government instituted, and what were the duties of the governor? The new theory of the atonement partook of this tendency also, and was founded upon ideas of *government*. Hugo Grotius laid the basis of this doctrine in the necessity imposed on God, as a ruler, to prevent mischief and preserve order in his government. And Hugo Grotius also was the founder of modern international law, by his book on "The Laws of War and Peace," the object of which was to teach rulers to substitute a sense of justice toward the citizen and regard for the peace of society, for caprice and reckless ambition.

3. Thus we see that each age has developed that particular view of the doctrine which was suited to its circumstances, and to its prevailing tone of thought. We are not however to infer that these theories are merely arbitrary speculations, wholly destitute of reality and truth.

Their error seems to lie in their one-sidedness. In their logical form, they are all probably false, yet each may contain its leaven of truth. Thus, the fantastic and mythical doctrine of a conflict with the devil, may be founded in reality. As long as the origin of evil remains unexplained, so long evil must appear to the intellect a hostile power contending with God. Only by self-sacrifice and willing endurance can we redeem ourselves and others from its slavery and lead captivity captive. The sufferings of the good, and the death of martyrs, is the necessary price which must be paid in order to secure the progress of humanity. This price Christ paid on the cross, to redeem mankind from the power of evil. So also there is a truth in the idea of an atonement to be made to the Divine justice. The justice of God is his holiness as displayed in action. If God has a moral character, it must make him not only by his will, but also by the very necessity of his holy nature, averse from sin. There is then a law of the Divine nature, which seems necessarily to separate him from the sinner. God is separated from the sinner by the necessity of his nature, no less than the sinner from God by the voluntary act of disobedience. The work of Christ therefore was not only to remove the obstacle to reconciliation on the side of the sinner, but also that on the side of God. The first he removes by making the sinner penitent, the second by making him holy. When penitent, he is reconciled to God; when holy, God is reconciled to him. A similar truth may be detected in the theory of Grotius. But the error in all these systems is to make that a limitation of God's will, which is in reality a manifestation of his nature.

4. Nor are we to suppose that this succession of theories is merely a change from one error to another, merely a substitution of one defective statement in the place of another as defective. There has been not only change but progress. Through the whole history of the doctrine we see a steady advance of thought, and what each age has gained, that it retains. The doctrine beginning at first as a transaction in the supernatural world, beyond the sphere of human experience, comes at last into the region of human ideas and relations. Beginning in a fantastic realm of images, and passing through a metaphys-

ical world of abstractions, it enters at last the domain of spiritual experience. Its course is not yet ended, nor has it as yet taken its complete and perfect form, in which it can satisfy the demands both of the reason and of the religious nature. But it cannot go back to any of its previous forms. Their defects having been once fully seen, the possibility of their recovering their former influence is forever prevented. The course of this doctrine, like that of all theology, is forward — tending toward the time which shall see realized the harmonious union of reason and revelation, of faith and works, of the supernatural and the natural, of the spirit and the understanding, of the faith of the heart and the faith of the intellect. J. F. C.

Art. II. — IMMORTALITY.

Miss Sedgewick, in her "Home" represents a little boy as dictating a sermon for his mother to write down, in the following words. "My peoples, if you are good, you'll go to heaven, and if you a'nt you won't." This seems to us the substance of all preaching and the chief support of goodness.

The belief in immortality and future retribution is the great source of hope and fear, and the only solution of the enigma of our present condition. It illumines what is dark in us and raises and supports what is low. It is the chief foundation of self-respect and of respect for others, the great motive for self-culture, the great stimulus of virtue. The philanthropist labors for beings, the philosopher for wisdom, that shall endure forever. Without this belief, the motives to goodness would diminish with increasing years. The strong sense of religious obligation grows out of the strong sense of immortality. Our duty is commensurate with our destiny.

The moral nature of man has slowly reached its present state of advancement by means of the combined action of thousands of minds in successive ages. To give men the dispositions which some persons think natural, philosophers and philanthropists have labored in all past time. Every

clear exposition of Divine truth, every bright exhibition of Christian character has lent its aid to make them what they are. As sculpture brings out a graceful statue from a rugged rock, so Christianity has brought to light the Divine image in man. The immortal hope which it holds forth has made him worthy of immortality.

But we are slow to perceive the force of external influences, as the notions of many among us abundantly show. We live in the last of a long line of generations which have been moulded by the operation of revealed truths. With the progress of time, these truths have been sinking deeper and deeper into the constitution of society and the nature of man. They have incorporated themselves with all our literature; with our whole code of moral principles and positive laws; with all our habits of thought, of speech, and of action; with our whole education, direct and indirect, from the earliest dawn of thought and feeling. The infant drinks them with his mother's milk, we breathe them with the vital air. And yet men are found among us who proclaim that they have no need of a revelation. They do not see the atmosphere that encompasses them, and so deny that it sustains their lives. With such facts before our eyes, it would not be strange if we should not be aware how much the thought of a future state of retribution operates on us. A man may say that in doing or avoiding any act he seldom has this idea in his mind. And it may be true that it is not often the immediate motive of his conduct; but it is the great primary motive giving efficacy to a thousand obvious ones. He has been trained to believe in a future state. He feels nearly the same assurance of it that he does of his present existence. The work of self-improvement he habitually regards as the education of a nature which is to exist forever. His powers of thought and action, of self-direction and self-control derive their chief interest from his consciousness of immortality. This consciousness, though it may not always be distinctly recognised, is always present. The very fact that it operates uninterruptedly, tends to prevent it from attracting attention. If a carpenter were asked why he had put a strong timber into a particular part of a house, it would be natural for him to reply, that in was intended to bear a great weight. If his questioner were then to remark, 'I

perceive that you always keep in mind the great principle of the gravitation of all substances on the earth's surface towards its centre,' he might perhaps reply, that so far from always thinking of it, he hardly ever had it in his mind. Yet it would be obvious that the principle was hardly ever out of his mind, but being always taken for granted was seldom the subject of distinct thought. And in like manner we act under the constant conviction that we have entered on a state that shall never end.

The thought that the consequences of well or ill-doing may extend through distant ages gives intensity to the remorse which follows sin and the gratification which follows well-doing. These are proportioned to our sense of the consequences of our conduct. The more distinct our conviction that our conduct is liable to affect ourselves and others to a degree beyond our power of conception, the more acute will be our moral sensibility. Under the influence of such a belief "descent and fall to us is adverse."

It has sometimes been questioned whether the doctrine of immortality should have prominent place among the motives to goodness presented to children; but when we observe how easily men accommodate themselves to circumstances, and calmly sanction the greatest outrages upon right, if they have been educated in the practice of them; when we see slave-holding, which is abhorred at the North, upheld by the mass of slave-holders in our Southern States as conformable to reason and Scripture; when we look back at the gladiatorial shows of ancient Rome, in which troops of men were compelled to butcher each other in the amphitheatre, for the amusement of all classes and both sexes in that highly civilized city; and when we remember that there is hardly a vice which was not practised among the enlightened Greeks and Romans as a religious rite, in honor of some one of their crowd of gods, we shall be slow to believe in such a natural constitution of the mind, as would enable us, in the education of children, to dispense with any of the motives to the practice of virtue which religion presents. Least of all can we dispense with the strongest.

The habitual thought of immortality seems to us as indispensable as the habitual fear of God. In fact the

former is the chief support of the latter. It is the feeling of our eternal dependance on the Almighty, which fills our souls with overpowering awe when we think of him. "Whither can I flee from thy presence?" says the Psalmist. But this question would lose its terrible significance, if men could throw off their dependence with their lives.

The doctrine of immortality is the great source not only of our sense of religious obligation, but of our respect for ourselves and our race. We look into ourselves, and see how partial is our culture and how imperfect our views. We look around us, and see multitudes of half educated beings despising others whose education is different but perhaps not more incomplete, and these in their turn regarding the former with contempt. The man of action despises the slowness and indecision of the man of speculation. The latter despises the superficial views of the former, his ignorance of principles, and mere aptitude for details. Each sex sees the deficiencies of the other. The sight of the decaying faculties of age continually suggests painful thoughts of the possibility of the extinction of the soul. Under this consciousness of imperfection, and amid this exhibition of weakness and decay, our principal satisfaction is found in the revelation of a future state in which the soul may have freer scope, and develope its energies without the clog of a material frame, which decays like other material organizations, and for a time makes its immortal partner share in its infirmity.

Ought not a doctrine so important be presented often and strongly in the instruction of the young? If immortality is the great motive to goodness held out in the Gospels; if it gives to ourselves, to our fellow-men, and to the present life their chief worth in our eyes; if every death brings it to our minds, and every prayer for the dead makes it the mourner's chief consolation; if literature, preaching, and religious conversation are full of it; if "the dread magnificence of heaven," as it daily and nightly passes before our eyes, awakens in us a burning desire to soar from earth and explore the wonders of remote creation; if all our hopes of an extended knowledge of spiritual natures, and of God himself, rest on the expectation of a future life; if our horror at vice and our delight in virtue are infinitely increased by the thought that they may carry with them

weal or woe forever; if the soul "shrinks back on herself and startles at destruction;" if every step in our progress shows the hollowness of all merely earthly good; if no reasonable man would live over again any year of his past life; then our best thoughts and hopes must centre in the future; and how can we abstain from teaching the young to govern themselves by the motive which mainly governs us?

In order to train children to act as immortal beings, it is important early to impress them with the idea of their immortality. The character of the present life is determined by the continuance of existence beyond the grave. Man's immortality raises him from an animal to a spiritual being, makes him but little lower than the angels, and "crowns him with glory and honor." We should not teach a child to look upon retribution as confined to a life beyond the grave, for retribution is taking place continually. All future time, here or hereafter, will be a state of retribution. But we should teach him that as the future will never end, the consequences of well and ill-doing may be endless. We do not see how the full extent of these consequences can be shown, without a frequent reference to the doctrine of immortality. We do not know on what ground the habitual inculcation of this doctrine can be deemed objectionable, unless it be thought that there is something ignoble in a continual reference to a state of retribution as a motive for action. We cannot look on such a motive in such a light. "Happiness" is "our being's end and aim." We seek it at the beginning of life through means purely selfish; but, with the progress of years, the selfish and benevolent feelings become beautifully mingled. The infant has no reference to any feelings but his own. As his mind opens, he gradually becomes conscious of the necessity of restraining his impulses and regarding the feelings of others. The longer he lives, the more clearly he sees the intimate connexion of their good with his own. His benevolent feelings are more and more developed, and he discovers at length, that, to attain the highest happiness of which he is capable, he must labor heartily for the good of his fellow-men. Thus, by a beautiful arrangement of Providence, the love of self is made to cooperate with and stimulate the love of others.

The Christian doctrine of immortality brings that great primary principle of our nature which urges us to the constant pursuit of happiness into the closest alliance with virtue. It teaches us that all the good of which we are capable will come in the train of goodness. Compared with the majestic motives which it presents, all other motives sink into insignificance. It is the link that connects us with angels and with God. It is the great absorbing thought of the Christian's soul; the motto on his banner; his rallying cry in the conflict with the hosts of evil. The standard which leads the soldiers of Christ to victory, shines now as it shone to Constantine — in the skies. E. W.

ART. III. — CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH AND HER WRITINGS.*

THERE are few who have not heard of Charlotte Elizabeth, but many who have only heard the name, and know not whether even that be real or assumed. Multitudes have read some of her writings; if any have read them all, they must have had much spare time, and a little patience. Her books already published cannot amount to less than forty, as we should infer from having seen full half that number, and found allusions to many more. Nor are any of these books very small, while many are large duodecimos. They are now for the first time collected, and in the process of publication, in a "new uniform edition," making already two royal octavos, containing

---

1. *Personal Recollections.* By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. New York. 1844. 12mo. pp. 357.

2. *Principalities and Powers in Heavenly Places.* 12mo. pp. 298: 3. *English Martyrs.* 12mo. pp. 300: 4. *The Siege of Derry; or, Sufferings of the Protestants: A Tale of the Revolution.* 12mo. pp. 292: 5. *Helen Fleetwood.* 12mo. pp. 332: 6. *Wrongs of Woman.* Four Parts. 18mo.: 7. *Poems. The Convent Bell and other Poems.* 18mo. pp. 346: 8. *The Deserter.* 12mo. pp. 239: 9. *The Rockite. An Irish Story.* 12mo. pp. 203: 10. *Judah's Lion.* 12mo. pp. 406: 11. *Judæa Capta.* 18mo. pp. 234: 12. *Alice Benden, or, The Bowed Shilling.* 18mo. pp. 177: 13. *The Simple Flower, and other Tales.* 18mo. pp. 166: 14. *Tales and Illustrations for Young Persons.* 18mo. pp. 228: 15. *Philip and His Gardner. For Sunday Schools.* 18mo. pp. 151: etc. etc. By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH.

twenty-two separate productions. These do not comprise all that have yet appeared, and as the author is still writing, with an exuberant fancy, great industry, and a facility that hardly waits for subject or method, we may expect other volumes as large as these. Indeed in extent and variety of productions, she is not surpassed by any female writer unless it be Mrs. Sherwood, and in a certain kind of popularity and influence we doubt if she has been equalled by any of her sister authors since Hannah More, to whom many of her admirers compare her.

We have an obvious reason therefore for a special notice of Charlotte Elizabeth — the first that has appeared in this journal — independently of the intrinsic value of her writings. These writings fill too large a place in the religious reading of the present generation, young and mature, to be overlooked. They have obtained a reputation which secures for them an unhesitating reception among most of those called Evangelical Christians, and carries them, with little discrimination, perhaps no question, into the libraries and schools of the largest denominations in England and America. Some question, it is true, has lately been raised and doubts expressed, on account of the rapidity with which volume upon volume comes from the same untiring pen. On inquiring at some Sabbath-school depositories for her recent books, we have been answered in the negative, with a manner that seemed to say they had stopped taking her works, suspicious at least of the haste with which they are thrown off. Still they are read and commended, as much probably as any books of a religious character now issued. And they find their way into other beside professedly orthodox families and schools. Imbued as they all are with the language and religion of Calvinism, yet their fame and peculiar interest procure many readers who hold not an opinion perhaps in common with their pervading theology. This is one proof of the power of the author. We have felt this power, the more we have read. And we are the more anxious to analyze it, to examine the character of these numerous and successful works, and weigh impartially their claims upon the confidence of the community.

Charlotte Elizabeth is a remarkable woman. She is remarkable for great activity and fertility of mind, with

absolute devotion to her own views of truth and duty; and equally remarkable for an exaggerated idea of her reasoning powers, a dogmatic temper, and great knowledge of the letter rather than the spirit of the Scriptures. We have read her writings with increasing admiration of her perfect self-consistency and self-complacency, her unquestioning faith, inflexible principle, fearless courage, fervent piety, and withal an overweening estimate of her own learning and logic, and a sense almost of infallibility, while enslaved to a system of false doctrine, restricted charity, and monstrous incongruity. We have found in her volumes far more interest and instruction than we expected. We took them up as a task, and have perused them as a pleasure; seldom unmixed pleasure, but enough to carry us on, and make us wish to see the end. Few of her works have we seen that call not for great discrimination, and therefore there is little that we could put freely into the hands of the young, or the library of a parish. Still there is something deeply interesting, in seeing a woman devote herself, so unreservedly and generously through a life of varied trial and serious obstacles, to the one great work of converting souls to Christ. And the fact, that her idea of conversion, n its process and proofs, seems to us erroneous and injurious, while she deserves the expression of our confidence in her entire sincerity, makes us the more desirous of giving a brief sketch of her life, with comments on her different writings.

The name of this author is not assumed, as seems to have been commonly thought. *Charlotte Elizabeth Murray* was her maiden name. And her use of only a part of it as an author was not fanciful, but owing, as we infer from her delicate allusions, to the danger of losing all the profits of her pen after her marriage with Mr. Phalan, an Irish officer. That marriage was not happy, but whether dissolved by divorce or death, we do not know. She is now Mrs. Tonna, residing near London, and devoting herself entirely to writing. Most that is known of her is learned from the "Personal Recollections," one of her largest and best works. It is an autobiography, in Letters to a friend who urged her writing it, and to whom she gives this reason for consenting — that the correspondence and papers of public characters are always seized after

their death, and often improperly used; and as she does not wish to expose herself to this danger, she is willing to write her own history. This reason, which she extends over two or three pages of the introduction, may illustrate the simplicity and complacency to which we have adverted, and which appear in many parts of the "Personal Recollections," though never offensively. After the celebrity already acquired, we can pardon that anticipation of posthumous importance, which led her to keep a friend, as she did for many years, under a solemn pledge to proclaim her wishes in regard to her correspondence immediately after her death, that she might not be left "at the mercy of ill-judging or ill-informed survivors."

In this autobiography there are no dates and few names. She has certainly not been guilty herself of betraying confidence, and has made none but the most cautious allusions to her more private life. The account of her childhood is full of interest. She was born at Norwich, England, in a house just opposite "the dark old gateway of that strong building, where the glorious martyrs of Mary's day were imprisoned." To this fact she ascribes some of her early and indelible impressions in behalf of the cause of Protestantism, to which she dedicated her life. No feature of her character is more prominent, no feeling does she more frequently record, than her hatred of Romanism. We must call it hatred, for it is such to a degree that seems to us hardly consistent with the Christian temper. It makes by far the largest subject of her writings, being the direct topic of many of them, and appearing in nearly all. It is in fact her peculiar mission — to be remembered by all who would know her life, and do justice to her character — the mission to which she believed herself early called, and which she has followed to this hour; namely, to expose the gross and fatal errors, the enormous iniquities, of the Roman Catholic religion. Naturally of a fervid temperament, highly imaginative and for a time boldly speculative, reveling in nursery tales of fairies and goblins, with a beautiful buoyancy of spirit prompting to the greatest activity of limb and mind, a passionate lover of nature, music, ancient architecture, and all real or imagined wonders, imbued moreover from infancy, with a reverential awe of God and an utter abhorrence of

idols and idolaters, it is easy to understand, with what feelings she looked daily on the gloomy prison of the Protestant martyrs, lingered around the "Lollard's Pit," and listened to her father who often talked to her on the spot "where Mary burnt good people alive for refusing to worship wooden images." Her father was an eminent clergyman of the Established Church, and in answer to his daughter's many questions about the prison and the pit, he one day placed on a chair the old folio of "Foxe's Acts and Monuments," in venerable black letter, and left the child to examine it. Long and intensely did she pore over it, unable to decipher much of the letter, but devouring the wood-cuts "with aching eyes and a palpitating heart;" and when she had finished, asking her father in trembling emotion — "Papa, may I be a martyr?" The answer encouraged rather than repressed the feeling. And thus at six years old began the purpose and the "Protest," which she has been uttering ever since. Her prayer still is, as she expresses it in the "Personal Recollections," and as it breathes through all her life and works, that "whenever the Lord calls me hence, or whenever the Lord himself comes to earth, he may find his servant not only watching, but working against the diabolical iniquity that filled the Lollard's Pit with the ashes of his saints."

At this early age, Charlotte Elizabeth met with two peculiar trials, one of which has followed her through life. Her love of books and passion for acquirement led her to read so constantly, especially in bed at early dawn, as to bring on total blindness. She then gave herself up to the enjoyment of conversation and music. Her father's house was the resort of literary men, among whom she names Dr. Parr, and speaks of the effect upon her eager mind of the animated discussions and collisions of such disputants, leading her to become "a thinker, a reasoner, a tory, and a patriot." But her great and absorbing enjoyment was music. In this she was fully gratified, her father and other friends feasting her with sacred melody, until she would whisper, in an ecstacy of joy, "I don't want to see, I like music better than seeing." But soon this gratification also was withdrawn, by the loss of her hearing; and this enthusiastic child, an ardent lover of books, nature, conversation, and all harmony and beauty, became blind and deaf! It

is impossible not to feel, from this fact, a livelier interest in her early history, and those subsequent efforts, on which so peculiar an experience must have had a great influence. The blindness was of short continuance, but entire deafness has remained, and cut her off for life from enjoyments of which her nature was exquisitely susceptible. She seems to have met the disappointment with cheerfulness, and never adverts to it as a calamity. In this respect, we admire the true delicacy with which her whole biography is written. She says as little as possible of her trials, which were many. She speaks of herself with the greatest humility, and in the language of her system, calls her early conscientiousness and strict veracity "self-righteousness." "We were baby Pharisees," she writes of herself and her only brother, in describing their rigid adherence to truth. The stress she lays on the importance of this trait is somewhat weakened, if we are to consider it only as pharisaical. In a single instance she was induced to violate the truth, at the instigation and for the benefit of a servant. Her embarrassment led to inquiry, and she frankly confessed. It is a curious comment on the disposition of the child and the religion of the father, that in this solitary case of falsehood, followed by confession and remorse, he sent to a neighbor to borrow "an instrument of chastisement, never before needed in his own house;" and that she bore the affectionate but severe infliction even with gratitude; wishing every stroke had been a stab, weeping because the pain was not great enough, and loving better than ever a father whom she always idolized.

On recovering her sight, with the loss of hearing, she devoted herself entirely to books; reading thus early all the British Poets, abandoning her wild fancy to the wonderful creations of Shakspeare, and indulging a poetical passion which seems not to have injured her, but which she afterwards unsparingly condemns as a waste of time, if not a snare of Satan. That Satan was then devising all means, to secure her powers of imagination, quick perception, and mental energy, she declares her belief, with an honesty that betrays a little vanity and a frightful view of God's agents. "I know that Satan, to whom such instruments are exceedingly valuable, marked me as one who could, if properly trained to it, do his work effectually within his

own sphere; and I am not more sure of my present existence, than I am of the fact that he strove to secure me for that purpose, from the first expanding of those faculties which evidently lie exposed to his observation, and open to his attacks, or as far as God permits him to work." We give this in her own words, as another index to her mind and the tone of her writings. Coeval with her abhorrence of Popery, and inseparable from it, was this inwrought and ever-growing conviction of the personal presence, and terrible machinations, of the devil and his agents. To this subject she adverts in all her writings, and devotes to it the whole of one of the largest of her treatises, to which we shall again refer. There is another feature of her childhood, and element of character, to be noticed here. The intensity of her mind was given, even in early childhood, to politics, as well as poetry and religion. Indeed at that stirring period, in that country, and with her views of Popery, religion was identified with the political and social condition. It was the time of Napoleon's menaced invasion of England; and it shows the terror of his name, that this girl of six or seven years of age, with her companions, fully believed that Napoleon would personally attack their house, and while they sought hiding-places, determined to try if they could not by some means themselves "kill Bonaparte." The war-spirit was then predominant. She gave herself up to it. She encouraged it in her brother, and so far stifled her devoted affection for him, as to persuade him to make arms his profession, and help him to urge upon the reluctant parents the "offering up of their only son, the darling of all our hearts, to the Moloch of war."

Her love of this brother is one of the most touching traits of Charlotte Elizabeth's early and later character. Nothing can exceed the tenderness and sweetness with which she always speaks of one, whom she describes as her second self. "He was to me what the natural sun is to the system. — The brightest, the sweetest, the most sparkling creature that ever lived, he was all joy, all love. We were never separated; our studies, our plays, our walks, our plans, our hearts were always one. That holy band which the Lord has woven, that inestimable blessing of fraternal love and confidence, was never broken, never loos-

ened between us, from the cradle to his grave; and God forbid that I should say or think that the grave has broken it." It is a frightful proof of the demon-spirit of war, that it not only demands the sacrifice, but can pervert to its own purpose the strength, of this beautiful, heavenly love of a sister's heart. This brother, with her own words and hands, she girded for the battle. He left the loved home a blooming boy, he plunged into the fierce conflicts of that terrible period, returned with 'honor and promotion,' completed his studies for a soldier's life, was ordered to Ireland, and there drowned. His sister, when seven years old, had saved him from a watery grave, at the imminent risk of her life; and bitter were the tears she now shed over a still untimely death, and yet more bitter the memory of that sad delusion which separated such loving hearts. She could only rejoice in the hope, though with some agonizing fears, of the timely conversion and sure acceptance of that endeared brother.

Such were the childhood and training of Charlotte Elizabeth. We have given them particularly, as showing the foundation of her character, and affording the best idea at once of the interest which her life awakens, and the errors which pervade her writings. We attempt not to follow her through all the changing experience and incident which she faithfully describes. Reduced by her father's death to a small income to be shared with her mother, she resolved to become a novel-writer; from which she was saved, providentially she thinks, by her marriage to an officer whose regiment was in Halifax, where he soon required her to join him. The passage, which she made in a government-ship filled with troops, was an era in her life, and she abandoned herself to the enjoyment of all the wonders and perils of the ocean, with a romantic, child-like rapture. She lived on deck; no weather, no danger, no orders scarcely, could drive her below. Once there was imminent danger, and we wish to give her description of it, as a specimen of the power of her pen and the temper of her mind.

"The extreme peril to which I have alluded overtook us when within a short distance of our destination: we were suddenly caught by a tremendous wind from the south, which blew us right in the direction of Cape Sable, one of the most fatal head-

lands in those seas. Night closed upon us, and the gale increased; sails were spread, in a desperate hope of shifting the vessel's course, but were instantly torn into ribbands. At one time, for a moment, the rudder broke loose, the tiller-rope giving way under the violent strain upon it; and the next minute the spanker-boom, an immense piece of timber, snapped like a reed. It was an awful scene; on the lee side, the ship lay so low in the water that everything was afloat in the sleeping cabins; and the poor ladies were screaming over their terrified children, unheeded by the gentlemen, every one of whom was on deck. The captain openly declared we were bound for the bottom, if a sudden and unlikely change of wind did not take place. In the midst of all this, I was reported missing, and as I had the privilege of being every body's care, because, for the time being, I belonged to nobody, a search was commenced. A young officer found me, at last, so singularly situated that he went and reported me to the captain. I had climbed three tiers of lockers in the state cabin, opened one of the large stern windows, and was leaning out, as far as I could reach, enraptured beyond expression with the terrific grandeur of the scene. The sky above was black as midnight and the storm could make it, overhanging us like a large pall, and rendered awfully visible by the brilliancy of the waters beneath. I had heard of that phosphorescent appearance in the sea, but never could have imagined its grandeur, nor can I essay to describe it. Even in perfect stillness the illuminated element would have looked magnificent; what, then, must it have been in a state of excessive, tumultuous agitation, the waves swelling up to a fearful height and then bursting into sheets of foam; every drop containing some luminous animalculæ sparkling with vivid, yet delicate lustre. We were going with headlong speed before the wind, and I hung right over the track of the rudder, a wild, mad eddy of silver foam, intermingled with fire. There was something in the scene that far overpassed all my extravagant imaginings of the terribly sublime. The hurry, the fierceness, the riot of those unfettered waters, the wild flash of their wondrous lights, the funereal blackness of the overhanging clouds, and the deep, desperate plunge of our gallant ship, as she seemed to rend her way through an opposing chaos; it was perfect delirium; and no doubt I should have appeared in keeping with the rest to any external observer; for I was stretching out at the window, the combs had fallen from my hair, which streamed as wildly as the rent sails; and I was frequently deluged by some bursting wave, as the dip of the vessel brought me down almost to the surface. The peril of an open window was startling to those on deck, and the captain hearing that I refused to relinquish my post, sent the mate to put up the dead lights; so I sat down on

the floor, buried my face in my hands, and strove to realize the magnificence thus rent from my sight." — *Personal Recollections,* pp. 86–88.

She spent two years in Nova Scotia, enjoying the novelty and hardship of the country, and perfecting herself, both from necessity and choice, in culinary accomplishments; and well does she commend to all young ladies "that obsolete study called good housewifery." Returning to England, her husband became entangled in a law-suit in Ireland, and she was called there. She went with the greatest reluctance and the most violent prejudices. Ireland, its religion and its people, she "cordially hated;" and for a time she wholly secluded herself, sullen, selfish, dissatisfied, and weary of life. Then and there came the great change — her conversion. To a nature like her's, with the views and influences in which she had been educated, with the pride of intellect and conceit of goodness which she says she had always cherished, and now in the midst of Catholics whom she despised, without any church to enter, or the power of hearing, or one Christian friend with whom she sympathised, we can easily conceive what *conversion* would be to her. It was awaking at once, with all her acute sensibilities, to the knowledge of herself as utterly depraved, and the application, for the first time, of the precepts, requirements, and blood of Christ to her own soul. Strange, that it should be the first time! We see its sincerity, we understand its power, we marvel at nothing except that these convictions should have been new to her, at that age and with all her advantages. We can hardly believe her, when she says — "Into Christian society I had never entered; nor had the least glimmer of spiritual light shone into my mind. My religion was that of a Pharisee, and my addresses to God included, like his, an acknowledgment that it was by Divine favor I was so much better than my neighbors." From such religion, may *all* be speedily and totally converted. It is an extraordinary statement from one who had been educated as she had been. And not less extraordinary is the summary explanation which she gives of the change, and of the principle or argument it involves: — "I thus argued: 'Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners: I am a sinner; I want to

be saved: he will save me.' There is no presumption in taking God at his word: not to do so is very impertinent: I did it, and I was happy."

From this point, Charlotte Elizabeth went on to examine and embrace all the Calvinistic doctrines, for which everything had prepared her. She had no difficulty, except with the doctrine of Election, which she soon found "running like a golden thread through the whole Bible." At the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed she stumbled a little, but not long. In that "high doctrine of the co-existent, co-equal Trinity," she expresses herself frankly as "wishing" to be well grounded; and she was. Of Socinianism" she evinces the greatest horror,* taking the impression from a woman who evidently knew nothing about it. On all these subjects she read nothing except the Bible and the Prayer-Book. To the Established Church she became more and more devoted, but attached little importance to the "bare succession, however Apostolical." Though she took narrow views, she held them in an independent spirit, and was as severe against the follies of her own Church, as of others; as may be seen in the connection in which she names Puseyism: — "The Lord preserved me from several snares of Socinianism, Popery, Irvingism, and Puseyism." Her abhorrence of Romanism would never permit her to look with favor on any symptom of return to the old abomination. She does indeed own in one of her later works, "Passing Thoughts," that the Liturgy of the English Church is no other than the Romish prayer-book, purged and reformed, and in that same work she argues strongly for the practice of "bowing" at the name of Jesus in the reading of the service; but in the same connection — with what consistency, we leave to others — she condemns alike the irreverence of "sitting" in prayer of many Episcopalians, and the genuflexion of the Catholics before the cross.

And now began the labor of her life, as a religious writer. It began in writing penny and two-penny tales for

* To show how amusingly ignorant of the subject the lady is, and how patient and forgiving *we* are, we give one sentence from her story of the "Deserter:" — "To be a worthy member of the Unitarian or rather Socinian communion, a man must be prepared to reject nine-tenths of the Old Testament, and the whole of the New."

the Dublin Tract Society. Remaining in Ireland through the critical period of 1822–4, when, by some artful predictions and exciting publications of Catholic priests, the common people were led to believe that in 1825 all Protestants who did not recant were to be put to death by Divine appointment, she exposed herself to the persecutions and perils induced by this belief. And it was no imaginary danger, when armed bands of the lowest classes in that oppressed and benighted land attacked the houses of Protestants, threatened the one in which she lived, and felt themselves authorised, as they were soon to be divinely commissioned, to put any and every heretic to death. We have nowhere seen so vivid a description of these recent and incredible horrors, as this writer gives in her "Personal Recollections." Her husband having left and her mother joined her, she lived in the family of Dr. Hamilton, an excellent clergyman of the Establishment, who was particularly obnoxious to the Catholics, and often in personal peril. Here for some time she supported herself by her pen, and did all she could to instruct the Irish and soften their prejudices. Her prepossessions against them had turned to the liveliest interest. She bears noble witness to the generous nature of the Irish heart, and the many beautiful traits of the national character. It should go to her high credit, that she invariably distinguished between the people and the religion, and dealt most tenderly with the sinner while she exposed and boldly denounced the sin. She was no hypocrite, and no tyrant. A bigot in doctrine, she was yet kind of heart and liberal in conduct. Nothing could induce her to enter a Romish church, or witness any of its idolatrous ceremonies; but she would visit the meanest hovel, and labor in all generous and gentle ways, to instruct the ignorant, or win souls from the "Great Harlot" to the "chaste Spouse of Christ." She was beloved by the poor Irish, her influence feared by the powerful, and direct attempts made in several ways to convert or ensnare her. In vain. In vain too was menace. She was told that she was particularly marked for destruction, in 1825. She labored on, openly and more actively. The question was seriously raised in the family circle, whether they should consent, in the coming crisis, to use the sign of blessing themselves, or "crossing," which was declared to

be the only chance of escaping martyrdom. She strenuously opposed it, and alone. All the household and friends, even Dr. Hamilton, brought reason and Scripture to prove the lawfulness of this mere sign, in mortal emergency. She persisted against it, the clergyman retired to "study it on his knees," and returned convinced that she was right.

Before the trial came, she was summoned to England. She left Ireland with even more reluctance than she had entered it. But she found some consolation in taking a part of it with her, in the person of a little dumb boy, to whom she had become attached, and begged him of his parents, whose poverty and gratitude consented. The story of poor "Jack" makes a large and pleasant chapter in her narrative. She converted him to her own faith, and he more than repaid her for all trouble by opening a strong mind, and the most docile and sweet spirit, to the blessed influences of love and truth. He lived and died with her, and she has written his history in a little book by itself, which none can read without interest, though they may find much of false doctrine and unauthorised inference. It may not be a contradiction, but it is a singular connection of principles, that while she regarded this child as a wonderful proof of "the sublime truth of personal election," she exclaimed, on finding an expansive brow under his matted hair, and being urged to give up all thought of his conversion — "No; with such a forehead as this, I can never despair of success."

Our readers may judge of the propriety of putting her books in their juvenile libraries indiscriminately, if we give them a single specimen of her way of indoctrinating this dumb boy in the deep mystery of the Atonement. She drew a picture of a crowd of persons, old and young, standing round a pit from which flames were issuing, and signified to the boy, that all these people, among whom were they, had been *bad*, and God would throw them into the fire. When he was sufficiently alarmed, she introduced another person, as God's Son who came from heaven; he "had not been bad, and was not to go into the pit; but he allowed himself to be killed; and when he died, God shut up the pit; so the people were spared."

We are glad to oppose to this an instance of her judg-

ment and kindness, in the case of a bad boy among a number of poor children whom she had gathered into a Sunday school, and taught alone, after her return to England. The incident is so well told, and so instructive also, that we wish to give it in her own words.

"I cannot help recording an event on which I look back with great thankfulness; though it was a terrible trial to me at the time. Two of my boys had a quarrel one week-day. One of them was very teasing, the other very passionate. The latter ran to a butcher's window close by, seized the large knife, and plunged it into the left side of his companion. Most mercifully the wound was not dangerous; the keenness of the knife was in his favor; it penetrated to within a short distance of the heart; but separated no large vein, and within a few days the boy was out again. The Sunday after it occurred, my party were exceedingly moved; they expressed great anger, and not a few threats were uttered against the culprit, whose parents had locked him up. On the following Sabbath I resolved to make an effort to avert bad consequences, and also to arrest the poor boy in his dangerous course. He had rather justified himself than otherwise, and had shown a spirit sadly unsubdued, and unthankful for his escape from a deadly crime and its awful consequences. I sent word to him to come to my party: he replied he would not. I repeated the summons, saying I should be exceedingly hurt if he did not. No answer was returned. The place next but one to me belonged to the wounded boy, that below it to his assailant; and the former was present, pale, indeed, but well. I lost no time in announcing to them that I expected P., which occasioned a burst of indignation, some saying they would not stay in the room with him, and the rest seeming to assent. 'Then,' said I, 'you must go, for he wants instruction most: and the very feeling that makes you shrink from associating with him, proves that you are better taught. So if you will leave me, do; I must admit him.' Just then P. was seen coming down the little garden: he entered, his walk very erect, his eyes unflinching, and his dark brows knitted. The looks of my young lads were very eloquent; his bold bearing exasperated them much. My heart seemed bursting its boundary with the violent palpitation of alarm, and other emotions which I could scarcely suppress; but I motioned to P. to take his usual place, and instantly rising offered up the usual prayer, with a petition for the spirit of mutual compassion, forgiveness, and love. I ceased, all remained standing, and certainly it was a period of most fearful interest. I looked imploringly at the wounded boy; he hesitated a moment, then suddenly turned, and with an air of

noble frankness, held out his hand to P., who took it directly. I then offered him mine; he grasped it, and burst into tears. A delightful scene followed, each pressing to seal his forgiveness in the same manner, while Jack's countenance shone with almost heavenly beauty on a spectacle so congenial to his loving heart. We had a most happy evening, and I could not but tell my dear boys how much I rejoiced over them. Whatever may have been the effect on the characters of those concerned, I know not. I am persuaded the proceeding was a means of averting much mischief. Boys are noble creatures when placed on their right footing; but I always think there is a great deal too much of what is technically termed old womanism in the mode of conducting their Scriptural education. They are pugnacious animals too, and require prudent management. News was brought me one evening, while they waited for admission, that two of them had stripped off their jackets to fight, the dispute being which loved their teacher most. 'Exclude them both to-night,' said a friend, 'and threaten to expel them.' Instead of which I sent word that the one who first put on his jacket loved me most, and that I was ready to begin. In they both came, smiling, and they got their lecture in due time, when a passage in point came before us." — *Personal Recollections*, pp. 287–290.

But we cannot find room for more of Charlotte Elizabeth's eventful life. Nor is much more told. She has continued her indefatigable labors, with pen, and by personal instruction; at one time spending from four to six hours every day for four months in the purlieus of St. Giles, London, against the remonstrances and fears of all her friends; becoming afterward editor of a periodical, which she continued for several years, if she does not still; sending out unceasing publications, in poetry and prose, from the smallest tract to large volumes and connected histories of different periods or events in the Church, and making it her great object in all to expose the errors of the Catholic, and remove the obstacles of the Jew. For in the Jews also she has of late years been intensely interested, manifesting towards them a spirit better than that which she sometimes expresses towards the Catholics. Her "Judæa Capta," just published here, is a condensed history of the siege and fall of Jerusalem. And "Judah's Lion," written earlier, is one of her most striking tales, illustrative of her interest in a race, for whose literal restoration she earnestly prays and as confidently looks. We

commend this last book, not to the young, but to discriminating minds, as having a great mixture of error and interest, and giving a specimen of her power in religious fiction, as well as her view of God's dealings and purposes in regard to his ancient people. That people she generously defends against the violent prejudices and cruel treatment of Christians. We have heard the rumor, that her present husband is a converted Jew. We know not the truth of this, but in the book now referred to, she draws a picture of a "converted Jew," as the hero of the story, with more naturalness and trustworthiness than usually belong to those who bear that appellation. At the same time she gives an unnatural character to a child about six years old, who insists on being a missionary to the Jews, goes with his parents to Jerusalem, is marvellously moved by the moral power of all he sees, and discourses eloquently on the Scriptures to the impression of young and old. We do not see that the child, or his parents, throw any light on the great question of the Restoration of the Jews. We are left still to ask, whether any promises intimate, or could have intended, that they should be restored as *Jews*. If not, if it be only meant that they are to be converted to Christianity, the greatest blessing we can desire for them, is it not idle to spend discussion on the question of place or country in which they are to dwell? It may also be asked, though we do not perceive that Charlotte Elizabeth ever thought of the matter, whether a people, whose first commandment was, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," given by Moses and repeated by Christ, can be said to be "restored," should they be led to the faith and worship of the "co-existent, co-equal Trinity."

It is difficult to class, or even enumerate, the various subjects on which this writer has employed her pen. The publication of her works in this country seems to have had no reference to the order of their original appearance. Nor was it necessary; for she herself evidently disregarded all order, all connection. Equally has she disregarded deliberation, mental preparation, or possible thoroughness. An idea of her rapid reading may be obtained from her statement, that once being pressed on a particular question, she went to her room at night, and seating herself on the bed,

read the whole of the New Testament, with the exception of a part of Revelation, before she slept. And as a writer, both her diligence and danger, not to say foolishness, may be seen in another statement, that in two years and two months, she "wrote the Rockite, the System, Izram, Consistency, Perseverance, Allen Mc'Leod, Zadoc, and upwards of thirty little books and tracts, beside contributions to various periodicals." All those here mentioned are books and tales of considerable length; the Rockite, now on our table, being a volume of two hundred pages; and Izram and Zadoc complete poems. At least these last have the form of poetry, though we may say, in a word, that nothing we have seen from her pen, under this name, has any higher character than ordinary verse, without a claim to true poetry, and altogether inferior in spirit and interest to her prose writings.

These writings, for the purpose of brief review, may be separated into the several departments of Juvenile, Fictitious, Historical, and Theological. Not pretending to be acquainted with all of them, we suppose an examination of about twenty will justify us in a few farther comments.

The Juvenile books are partly fictitious, but, like all her fiction, have for their basis some historical fact or passing incident. "Alice Bender, or the Bowed Shilling," the "Simple Flower, and other Tales," "Tales and Illustrations for Young Persons," "Falsehood and Truth," are intended for the young, but call for more of a reflecting and discriminating habit than many children possess. This is true of all her books of a juvenile character, that have come in our way. They are better fitted for young men and women, than for children. They require close attention and some effort of thought; a demand to which we do not object even in the smallest books, if it be not such, in respect to subject or language, as will prevent the interest of the child, or lead him to skip all the hard and 'good' parts. The books just mentioned convey many of the best lessons, give important suggestions and interesting facts for parents and children, but are pervaded by the writer's doctrinal views, and have for their leading object to imbue the young with that thorough hatred of Romanism, which makes so large an element in her own being. We are willing, we earnestly desire, that every child should be well

grounded in the knowledge not only of Christian, but also of Protestant faith. We see little to recommend to young or old in genuine Romanism. We might possibly satisfy even Charlotte Elizabeth, in our abhorrence of some of the absurdities and atrocities fairly chargeable on the Roman Catholic Church, under its assumption of infallibility in the midst of unsurpassed corruption and cruelty. Some of the facts given by this lady, as occurring under her own observation within a few years, are astounding. Yet we believe them to be the legitimate effects of the system, and to be apprehended in some form wherever the system becomes predominant. It is a serious question how we are to meet this danger, or prepare our children for a conflict which they or theirs may witness in our own land. But we would not hasten it by anticipation. We would not aggravate the evil by instilling early prejudices or kindling blind passions. We would cherish a spirit of mutual kindness, not alienation and hostility. We would point to virtues as well as vices, and recount the good not less than the evil deeds, of the Catholic Church or its prominent disciples. We would utter no word, and we grieve to read a word here, against the books of Thomas a Kempis and the admirable Fenelon. It seems to us a kind of impiety, to connect these names with the assertion, that "Satan transforms himself into an angel of light." Nor do we believe that the present remarkable champion of Ireland under her many wrongs, though his course is yet to be finished and his character fully known, deserves to be called the "great apostle of all evil," or to be looked upon with feelings of "mingled horror, compassion, and disgust." These violent expressions and severe judgments disfigure many of these books, and diminish their value especially for the young. The language just quoted, is in the "Personal Recollections." But similar language is found in the smallest stories. The strongest words are always used to describe the abominations of Popery. The youngest children are made to repeat these words, and to support them by prophetic figures and terrible denunciations from the Bible. We doubt not only the wisdom, but the justice, of the following description of Romanism, found in the "Simple Flower:" — "It teaches its followers that to eat meat, when their priest commands them to eat fish, is a more

deadly sin, than to blaspheme the name of Christ, and to do all manner of evil to his people." And we are very sure we should not send our children to a teacher, who, when asked, "What does *Catholic* mean?" should answer —"It is derived from two Greek words, and signifies the whole, or perfect truth, as taught from the beginning."

Under the name of Fictitious, we might bring many of the writings of Charlotte Elizabeth, using the word in the qualified sense already explained. In pure fiction she did not indulge as a writer, or as a reader, after her conversion, having excluded from her shelves all "the furniture of a worldly library," and urged others to do the same. All her writings are strongly religious in tone and object. But many are stories whose characters and incidents we suppose to be wholly fictitious, though all have the appearance of being drawn from actual observation. There are few plots, no love-stories, and seldom anything improbable. The writer has uncommon powers of description, and with her talent for invention also, her natural fertility and brilliancy of imagination, her early love of the poets and the great dramatist, and yet more with her sole dependence on her pen for support, she has shown more than common power of principle, to resist, as she did repeatedly, the most flattering and tempting solicitations to write for the popular journals and cater to the insatiable appetite for fiction. Her partial friends have sometimes intimated, that had she gone into that department, she would have rivalled Dickens. This is extravagant. But for a class of minds, to which Dickens is little known and perhaps forbidden, she has furnished similar food, and in some respects more wholesome stimulus, in her moving pictures of Factory Life in England. Without unveiling all the foul corruption and loathsome depravity, she shows the enormous wrongs and terrible suffering of those, who are doomed from infancy to the merciless labor of the mills. "Helen Fleetwood," one of her longest tales, is entirely devoted to this object, and with few faults, has a powerful interest and noble moral. The four parts of the "Wrongs of Woman" have the same purpose; a very different purpose from that which the title might indicate in these times. They say nothing of "woman's sphere," except that in England it lies at home peculiarly; no objects abroad, however worthy, not even

the Heathen in Pagan lands, having claims so pressing as the many heathen close at hand, in the streets and hovels, the factories and mines, of their own Christian country. Such sentiments we rejoice to find in the pages of such a writer. Her courage is worthy of all praise, when she declares and proves that the degradation of large classes in her own land far exceeds that of the Heathen, and makes this appeal to those engaged in promoting education in India: —"Very great is the zeal, and very commendable is the diligence evinced by English ladies to promote this work, and to enlist the sympathies of all around them for its extension. Still we must ask, how do these ladies contrive to overlook the objects perishing so near them, and to confine their compassionate cares to others so very far removed." We find this and more of the same tone in the third part of the "Wrongs of Woman;" and this work, with the others of like character, seems to us the most unexceptionable of her writings, and the most interesting and useful. She must needs introduce, indeed, a little of her peculiar doctrine here, where it is most irrelevant; but there is very little, and if we put any of her books into our social libraries, it would be these; to let Americans compare their condition with that of multitudes even in England, and be excited to Christian sympathy and generous effort for the poor and ignorant around them. There are greater objections to the other Tales, as the Rockite, the Deserter, and others, which paint so glaringly, we hope with some exaggeration, both the sufferings and the vices of the Irish, under the intolerable pressure of poverty and the unmitigated curse of Popery.

The class of books which we call Historical, from the pen of Charlotte Elizabeth, is not large. At least of those republished in this country, the number is very small. "Judæa Capta," a succinct account of the fall of Jerusalem, has been already named; it is well written, but has no distinction, except its singular use of Scripture, turning every passage of the Old Testament having any allusion to the great city or temple, into a literal prediction of the coming doom. The "English Martyrs" is a very different work, and much superior. It seems to be an abridgement of some larger work of her own, and to consist chiefly of facts from Fox's Martyrology, given in her own words, avoiding all

that is offensive in Fox. The language is pure, and the comments few and charitable, especially for one so hostile to Roman power and priestcraft. We remember no book that presents in a better form, within the same compass, a fair history of the martyrdom of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and many less known. And excepting a few phrases, always to be expected, there is nothing doctrinal or sectarian that should prevent its free use. The preface to the American edition, by Bickerstell, is more questionable than anything in the book. — The "Siege of Derry" is a sort of historical romance, giving, in the experience of a single family, a graphic and thrilling description of one of the most remarkable events in the range even of religious war. If any one would understand the power of principle and endurance in Protestant sufferers, or the temper of Popish persecutors, within no remote period, let him read this account of the protracted siege, and incredible woes, and seemingly superhuman deliverance of the little town of Derry. The writer's strong predilections may have betrayed her into some exaggeration, on either side. We cannot assert the contrary; neither can we endorse all the reasoning and conclusions against the arch-enemy, whom she never forgets and never spares — Popery. But we know she is not capable of a conscious misstatement; and making only the allowance that is always to be made for religious prejudice, we believe the book to be as valuable as it is interesting. Some sketches of Irish character, and instances of Popish superstition and power, might well be quoted. But we must pass to the remaining division of these voluminous writings.

Theological. As before, the word is used for convenience, not for exact definition. We have seen no system, no creed or criticism, from this author, that can be called strictly theological. She does not pretend to be an expositor or controversialist. She disclaims all knowledge of theological works, and implies as to all disputed points, as she says expressly of Election, when urged by opponents to read various treatises — "pro or con, no treatises have I read." Her religious reading seems to be confined exclusively to the Bible. Of this no one could complain, if she did not at the same time pronounce so dogmatically on the meaning of portions of the Bible, which have been always in

dispute, and are allowed by all to require some study of the principles of interpretation, and some knowledge of external authorities and facts. Unless Charlotte Elizabeth is sure that her own reason is a safe interpreter of God's words and ways, unless indeed she claims a portion of that infallibility the pretension to which she so abhors in the Church of Rome, we see not how she attains such absolute confidence, or expects others to repose this confidence, in her interpretation of the oldest writings in the world, or her application to passing events of the most remote predictions, the faintest types, and the boldest figures. Yet such is her theology. We have no faith in it, and we do not attempt either to refute or explain it. It is bald Calvinism, and that is enough. It is so utterly unscriptural and irrational, that it has no power to disturb us; and we read the much that is true and excellent in these volumes, with scarcely a thought of the rest. There is however one feature of this system, as here presented, which does surprise us. It makes the entire subject of a large volume, the only one that can be further considered.

It is the volume which stands second in the list given at the head of this article — "Principalities and Powers in Heavenly Places." This and the "Personal Recollections" are the most important of this lady's productions. The latter, we venture to say, will always be read, as a natural, spirited, and most interesting specimen of autobiography, with all its faults. But the "Principalities and Powers" will have a shorter life and a more limited interest, unless we mistake the signs of intellectual and religious progress. A whole book, based on the assumption, and devoted to the elucidation, of the personal existence, the literal presence, the infernal, unalloyed malignity, the supernatural and universal agency, we might almost say, the omniscience and omnipotence, of Satan, with his army of fellow-demons, well marshalled, ever active, obedient to their commander, hovering over all human souls, penetrating all common and sacred retreats, wielding all weapons, approaching us in every disguise, besetting the path of every spirit from the cradle to the grave, warring, always wrathfully and cunningly, often successfully, against Christ, truth, aspiration, and Almighty God! We do not wonder, that a writer in the "Christian Review," who notices this work favorably,

and thinks it needed and useful, is yet constrained to say, that any one who should fall in with all her views, would be apt to ascribe too much of the evil of his own heart to outward influences; "would make Satan a convenient sort of scape-goat, bearing all his sins." It has always been a marvel to us, that those who believe in the original and total corruption of our nature, should think it also necessary to fill the external world, the air, the street, the school, the closet, the temple, and the whole earth, with evil spirits and pursuing demons, to tempt and try us enough for the Creator's purpose! A truce to the charge, that *we* think too well of our nature, and too little of the tempter. We think too much of the tempter *within*, to look abroad for invisible agents, or listen to the whispers of possible fiends. Believing neither in native depravity nor native holiness, but in vast capacities of good and evil, with passions of tremendous force and fire, appetites and senses long predominant before reason and conscience can rule, placed in a world of conflicting elements and designed probation, among men of all characters from the best to the worst, and at best frail, ignorant and erring, while all history and experience show the frightful prevalence and power of selfishness and lust, avarice and ambition — we find temptations enough, and our sins, countless and enormous as they are, sufficiently explained, without laying the burden of proof or the load of guilt either upon Adam or Satan.

We are not discussing the question of the existence of evil spirits. We believe in the existence and ministry of good angels, and we find in the Scriptures reference to bad angels also, one of whom is represented as chief, the personification and prince of evil. That much of the language so used is figurative, we know; though it does not follow that all of it is. When Christ said to his disciples — "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil," when he says to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and when again he describes the infirm woman as one "whom Satan hath bound these eighteen years," it is not easy to give the word "Satan" the usual terrible signification. And it is to be hoped that Paul meant to be understood in some qualified sense, where he declares he has delivered certain men unto Satan. To say nothing of

the metaphor and imagination of the East, similar language is sometimes used now without the least idea of literalness. Nor are any terms used in Scripture to portray Satan, stronger than those which ascribe to the Deity human organs and passions, making him angry, jealous, and revengeful, even arming him with bow and quiver, sword and buckler. Still the belief in Satanic agency has so universally prevailed in all ages, there is so much that favors it in the Bible, and it is so impossible to disprove it, that it is best to leave it as it is, and let it do all the good it can. There are minds that seem to require it, and delight in it, and regard its denial as almost atheistical. Little as we can understand this feeling, we will not make light of it. To us there are higher sources of strength, as well as greater reasons for alarm. We might indeed find relief, such as it is, if we could trace our evil thoughts and frequent sins to any agent or influence out of ourselves. But we cannot. We dare not. And we infer from the manner in which Charlotte Elizabeth complains of the unbelief and growing apathy of Christians on this subject, that we are not alone or peculiar in this respect. In her "Personal Recollections" she says — "Of all the errors into which the world has fallen, none is more fatally mischievous than the habit of overlooking the personality, the energy, the power, the watchfulness, the deep cunning of the Devil." She ascribes this degeneracy to the Devil's own influence, and in the "Principalities and Powers" reveals all his cunning, daring, knowledge and power. Her sketch of his character and kingdom is a melancholy curiosity. She believes that he prevails on Christian people to banish his name from their daily converse, and beguiles Christian teachers into fatal silence about him in their pulpits. She believes that he sees our thoughts, that he sends his myrmidons to watch and cheat us, that he clothes them, if he chooses, with miraculous power, as in the case of Pharaoh's magicians, that he has been constantly growing wiser and more expert through the practice of six thousand years, that he reads prophecy, studies the phenomena of nature, uses the elements, leads disciplined armies, visits churches to distil poison into the ear of preacher or hearer, flies with lightning-speed to another continent to do his ceaseless work, "gloats over the

slumbering city about to be inundated with a flood of burning lava," invents and directs the infernal engine of Popery, at a later day employs the different delusions of Irvingism and now of Puseyism — all for the same end; to blind, and seize, and burn forever, the souls of the damned. "He is at once the originator, the director, and the leader, of every species of rebellion in heaven and earth." Nay, "he dared to face, to taunt, and to tempt the Lord Jehovah himself" — with "enough of daring to brave, and enough of malignity to persecute, the Mighty Father, the Everlasting God, the Prince of Peace."

Had such thoughts and words as these come from any one of whom we knew nothing more, we should be led to doubt their sanity or their sincerity. In Charlotte Elizabeth, we doubt neither. And we will not give any more of her dark views, lest they prevent a just estimate of her spirit. That spirit is altogether better than her creed. She does not seem gloomy, but cheerful. We should not expect such a faith would make one amiable; but if she is not, it does not appear in her writings. Some of them take far brighter views of Providence, than those which we have seen. We desire to be just. The less we love her system, the more we honor the excellence that appears in despite of it. We shrink with horror from many of her doctrines, opposed alike to reason and revelation. Few of her books can be unreservedly recommended. Yet from most of them we have derived profit, and some possess a rare interest, with scarcely anything to regret. They are not for the young or undiscerning; but the mature, established, and candid, will not read them without some benefit. We do not wonder that they were prohibited in Italy, and all Papists who should receive them, denounced. With equal reprobation, probably, would she herself denounce the publications of some Dissenters, our own most. We exult in the liberty of caring for neither denunciation, but gleaning whatever of good we can find, whether in the despotic and cheerless dominion of the Pope, or the petty and exclusive kingdom of his inexorable and erring, but conscientious, fearless, uncompromising, and self-devoted antagonist — Charlotte Elizabeth.

E. B. H.

Art. IV. — CHRISTIAN PEACE, OR CHRISTIAN UNION?

We rejoice in the belief that there are many hearts, in all denominations, yearning for Christian peace. And we are satisfied from indications that have fallen under our notice, that there are those, even among sects heretofore the most exclusive, who have imbibed something of the true spirit of gospel charity, who are raised above the narrowing influence of sectarian sympathy, and who are striving to cherish and to manifest the spirit of Christian love towards those who may differ from them in opinion. Nay, more. We rejoice to find from the published works that have come in our way, that there are those who are willing to put forth their most strenuous efforts to make "the divided Church one." Yet the phrase, "Christian union," which such writers usually adopt, is not a favorite one with us. Terms and names often exert a greater influence over the feelings of a community than we are aware. And we have sometimes thought, that the frequent use of the phrase, "Christian union," is exerting an injurious influence upon the feelings of the Christian community. If, as we dwell upon this subject in thought or in conversation, we should think or speak of "Christian peace and harmony," would not a very different class of feelings be awakened within us? Christian *union*, in the sense in which the expression is most obviously and generally used, seems to us not to be at all desirable. Christian *peace and harmony* we should rejoice to see becoming more and more widely prevalent.

And when we use this latter phrase, we have in our mind a state of things, in which the different denominations, notwithstanding their distinctive peculiarities of opinion, worship or effort, and even in the midst of great differences in these respects, shall live together in peace and harmony, and manifest towards each other the true spirit of Christian love. It is not that we wish for an amalgamation of sects, or the abolition of all denominational distinctions. What we desire is the entire suppression of the sectarian spirit. Let there be, as there now are, different denominations, and let them retain their respective peculiarities of belief, of worship, or of religious operation. But let them recognize each other as Christians, and extend to each

other the courtesies of Christian friendship. Let them rejoice in each other's peace and prosperity, and ever cherish a willingness to assist each other. Such a state of the Christian community would present a scene, upon which Christ could look with pleasure. Then would Christians be one, in their sympathy with the spirit of their Master, in their resemblance to his character, in the objects of their prayers and efforts, and in their exercise of kindness and forbearance towards each other. And such a state of the Christian Church would be adapted to impress deeply upon the minds of all, a firm conviction of the reality, the heavenly origin and the divine power of our religion. When men see Christians, differing from each other in their religious opinions, in their forms of worship, and in their modes of operation, still breathing, amid all these differences, the same spirit of devotion to the will of God, of universal, all-embracing love to man, and of charitable forbearance towards each other, they must be deeply impressed by the sight. When men see Trinitarians and Unitarians, Presbyterians and Episcopalians, Methodists and Baptists, Universalists and those who hold to the eternity of future punishment, equally conscientious in all duty, — alike scorning to take advantage of each other in order to secure additions to their own number, ever disposed to speak kindly of each other, while yet they adhere firmly to their respective peculiarities, — then will they believe that there is a reality in religion, that it is not all mere profession; then will they believe that there is a divine power accompanying its operations, sufficient to control the heart and the life. Such a state of feeling and of practice would not be attributed to mere human policy. It would be regarded as the result of inward, vital, governing principle. It is not Christian union then, in the common acceptation of the term, that we desire, but Christian peace and harmony.

The proposed change of terms may seem, at the first glance, to be a matter of trifling importance. But we are fully satisfied that, upon more mature reflection, it will be seen to have important practical bearings. When we speak of union, we speak of what cannot exist unless two or more agree to unite. And we are therefore led to look upon Christian union as the result of mutual agreement

among Christians who differ — as an organized combination. We cherish the feeling, that if those who differ from us will not unite with us, we are by that circumstance absolved from all responsibility in the matter. We do not regard this desirable state of the Christian community as dependent upon individual character, or included within the sphere of individual duty. We feel that there may be circumstances, when others treat us unkindly, in which we are under no obligation to seek for Christian union. But if we speak of Christian peace and harmony, we at once perceive that it relates to a state of the community which depends on individual effort and character. And we feel that it is our duty, as individuals, to "follow after the things which make for peace," to cherish and manifest a spirit of peace, and to labor, in our respective spheres and with our several abilities, to become peace-makers among all around us. We feel, too, that this is a duty which arises from our relation to Jesus, the Prince of Peace, and which does not depend on the circumstances in which we are placed, nor yet on the treatment which we receive from others. We may be placed among those who differ from us essentially in opinion, who deny our right to the Christian name, and who pronounce our opinions the latest delusion of the Devil; or among those who seem to us to deny the very foundations of the Gospel. In such circumstances, it would be idle to talk of Christian union, as that term is generally understood. But we may speak of Christian peace, even under such circumstances, as an object at which we as individuals may aim. We may feel that we have a duty to perform to God, to our Saviour, and to our own souls, — a duty which consists in cherishing and manifesting a spirit of peace ourselves towards all around us. If treated unkindly by others, our spirit of peace will take the form of forbearance and forgiveness, and will prompt us to return good for evil — benevolent wishes, kind offices and fervent prayers, for bitterness, censure and reproach. If we are placed among those who reject what seem to us the foundations of all piety and virtue, our spirit of peace will be manifested in a readiness to allow them all the right of forming and publishing opinions which we claim for ourselves, in acknowledging that there may be sincere and honest devotion to what is regarded as truth, even in the

midst of what we deem error, and in giving them due credit for all of good there is in their dispositions or characters. The duty of cherishing this spirit of peace devolves upon every minister of the Gospel, upon all who claim to be ambassadors of the Prince of Peace. It is the spirit they should breathe, the spirit they should inculcate. It is a duty devolving upon every individual Christian. Each in his sphere, whether that sphere be more or less extended, should breathe the spirit, and seek to promote the prevalence of peace.

There are two important considerations, in favor of this view. If, as individual Christians, we have ever cherished and manifested the kind and forbearing spirit of gospel peace, have ever inculcated upon all within the sphere of our influence the importance of "following after the things which make for peace," and have ever, where it was possible, acted the part of peace-makers, we must have the satisfaction arising from the consciousness that we have done what we could to bring the Christian community into the state contemplated by the Saviour. We may console ourselves under the divisions and contentions, the bitterness and animosity, prevalent in the Christian community, with the thought, that this state of things arises from no fault of ours, that we have done all in our power to prevent so painful a spectacle.

Again; this course, of cherishing and breathing the spirit of peace ourselves, is the most effectual way of promoting peace around us. The spirit of love can never be excited by strength of argument. It is love only that begets love. It is the manifestation of the spirit of peace, on the part of individuals, that begets a similar spirit in those with whom they associate. We may employ the ablest and most convincing arguments with our neighbors, to show that it is their duty to cherish love for us. But if we do not at the same time manifest the spirit of love ourselves, our arguments will fall powerless upon their ears. We may prove to them that it is their duty to live in peace with us, and yet, if we ourselves manifest a contentious disposition, we shall have no reason to expect that we shall induce them to act in accordance with our arguments and our conclusions. But if we breathe the spirit of love, if we manifest all the kindness and forbearance of true Christian peace, it will not

be long before the most obstinate bitterness, in those who differ from us, will melt in the warmth of affectionate regard which flows from our hearts. So in regard to religious denominations. We may frame an argument which is sound in all its parts, and which conducts to a conclusion that cannot be set aside, showing that it is the solemn duty of denominations differing from us to cherish towards us a spirit of love, and to live in the exercise of Christian peace and harmony with us. But if at the same time we are treating their opinions or practices with severity or with sarcasm, we have no reason to expect that our arguments will be of any avail. If, on the contrary, we, as a denomination, manifest towards those who differ from us a spirit of love and forbearance, it will eventually soften their feelings and bring about a more desirable state of the Christian community. But communities are composed of individuals. If then the individual members of any denomination cherish and manifest the spirit of peace, their course may exert an influence upon others of their own denomination with whom they daily associate. It may also influence those of differing denominations with whom they often meet. In this way, by individual effort in cherishing in their own hearts and breathing everywhere around them the spirit of peace, denominations may be purified from all unchristian bitterness towards each other, and the whole Christian Church may be brought into a desirable state of harmony.

But if the cultivation of the spirit of peace be an individual duty, devolving upon each one of us at all times, we should seek to understand the nature of the duty and the right mode of performing it. We have sometimes feared, that the circumstance of speaking so much upon this subject has led us to look at it as separated from its true relation to other parts of the Christian character. We are prone to regard the peaceful spirit as a trait of Christian character to be cultivated by itself, and aside from other traits, or, at least, as only an equal associate with other traits. But, if we are not much mistaken, it is the result of progress in all the Christian graces. We see many around us differing from us in opinion upon points which we deem essential. We are ready to censure and condemn them. But, as our faith in the wisdom and justice of God's

overruling providence increases, we shall look with more kindness upon them. We shall perceive that, notwithstanding their rejection of what we regard as the essentials of God's revealed truth, he is showering blessings upon them, and we shall be disarmed of our bitterness by the thought.

Again; we wonder, at times, why it is that what appears so plain to us is so misunderstood or perverted by others. But, as we advance farther in our studies, and find our own minds occasionally wavering upon points where we had been previously settled in opinion, and perceive that evidence and arguments seem to be at times more, and then less weighty and conclusive, according to the state of mind in which we view them, and especially as the consciousness of our own liability to error is pressed upon the mind, our humility will be increased, and, with more humble views of ourselves will be connected more charitable feelings towards those who may differ from us.

Still further; man's natural desire is to have his own way. He is unyielding and obstinate in regard to all that is opposed to him. But when he becomes truly religious, he surrenders his own will to the will of God. This, however at first, is a matter of resolution and of purpose, rather than of feeling or practice. It requires time and effort to bring the feelings into an accordance with the resolutions and principles. At this stage of his religious course, the individual is in great danger of giving a new name to his self-will, which will enable him to indulge it without remorse. He may call it zeal for God and for his truth, and then in its indulgence may cherish bitter feelings towards those who are, as he thinks, the enemies of God and of truth. But as he makes progress in the Christian character, and brings his own will into more entire subjection to the will of God, he must, as a natural result, become more kindly disposed towards those who differ from him.

Once more; as we make progress in the Christian course, the practical gradually assumes superiority over the speculative. The cultivation of holiness becomes of much greater importance than mere correctness of speculative opinion. And he who is fully aware of the deceitful nature of sin, and alive to the importance of personal holiness, will sympathise warmly with another who is in a similar state of

feeling, even though he may differ widely in doctrinal belief. And he will be led, by sympathy of feeling and similarity of purpose, to charitable judgments in regard to differences of opinion. It will be perceived, therefore, that the spirit of peace is not merely a single trait, which may be cultivated separately from others, and in which we may excel while deficient in other and important features of the Christian character. It is the result of improvement in all the Christian graces.

We have been somewhat surprised, in looking at works upon "Christian union," to discover a proneness to point out some mode, of human invention, which may operate as a charm to heal all divisions and restore peace and harmony to the church. One suggests a new method of studying the Bible; another proposes some change in modes of religious organization. But, as we have reflected carefully on this subject, we have failed to discover any plan of our own adequate to all the necessities of the case and to the accomplishment of the desired purpose. We have been met, at every point, by the plain instructions of the Gospel. We find, we think, in these all that is necessary to make the "divided Church one." We feel that if men would but obey the practical precepts of the Gospel, nothing further would be required. Of this we shall be convinced, if we look at some of these precepts. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This is a practical precept, relating to the conduct of individual Christians, and taking cognizance of all their treatment of their fellow-men. Suppose that every Christian should conscientiously obey this precept, in all matters of difference upon religious subjects. Would there not be a change at once in the whole aspect of the Christian community? We, for example, are Unitarians; we are unwilling to be denied the Christian name, to have our views of Christian truth made the subject of sarcasm and ridicule, of censure and reproach. We know what our own feelings are, when we are treated by others in an unchristian manner. In these feelings we find our rule of duty in regard to those who may differ from us. And in following this rule, we shall, in regard to all such, carefully avoid those bitter denunciations, that ridicule, and sarcasm, which when applied to our own views are so

painful to us; while, at the same time, we exercise the liberty of pointing out freely, but in a proper spirit, the inconsistency between their opinions and the truth as it is in Jesus. Let then this single practical principle of the Gospel be heartily obeyed, in all the intercourse of those who, though they differ in opinion, yet claim alike to be the followers of Jesus, and the fountains of unchristian bitterness would be at once dried up.

Still farther; we are taught to forgive, to pray for, and to bless those who may treat us unkindly. Suppose, then, that when we hear of unkind remarks, which members of other denominations have made in regard to us, we summon a spirit of forgiveness, lift up our heart in prayer for them, and seek for opportunities to do them a favor, to return good for evil. Would not this ready and full obedience to a practical precept of the Gospel save us from much of the unhappiness, which unkind treatment might otherwise cause us? And might it not operate to soften the feelings of those who are now filled with bitterness towards us? But if it should not, if our opponents should repeat their unprovoked attacks, still we find in the instructions of Jesus a practical precept which meets the case. If our brother offend against us, even to seventy times seven, still we are directed to forgive. In other words, the spirit of forgiveness should be exhaustless in our hearts; we should in no instance cherish a revengeful temper, but should ever seek to return good for evil. We may see others embracing what we deem dangerous errors, and may be pained at the sight. But here too, there is a practical precept of our religion for our guidance — "To his own Master he standeth or falleth," — we are not appointed his judges. We may meet what we deem his errors with argument, but we should refrain from any unchristian denunciation of the man.

We have thus proposed what we have been led to regard as the "cure of religious dissensions." It consists in the sincere and diligent endeavor, on the part of each individual, as an individual, to acquire and breathe the spirit of Christ — the spirit of devotion to God and of love to man, a spirit which will prompt him to recognize the rights of all who differ from him, and forgive all who treat him unkindly. The cure we propose has in its favor one recommendation of

a peculiar character. All Christians, of all denominations, will at once acknowledge the reasonableness and the importance of the course suggested. The precepts to which we would direct attention are not the parts of the gospel system, in regard to which there is dispute. All recognize them as gospel principles, and admit that they are binding upon themselves as individual Christians. In order, then, that the course we recommend may be reduced to practice, no one is asked to change his opinions, to study the Bible in any new way, or to receive to the arms of his fellowship, as of the same faith with himself, those from whom he widely differs in what he regards as the essentials of the Gospel. Men are only asked to obey, in their daily intercourse with and treatment of each other, what they themselves acknowledge to be gospel precepts, which they are under the most solemn obligations to obey.

The cure of religious dissensions which we have proposed, has another important advantage. Many sincere Christians have often felt unwilling to unite with those who differ from them on what they have deemed important points of Christian doctrine. They have felt that by so doing they would be giving their sanction to what they have regarded as dangerous errors. And this difficulty will always arise so long as we speak of Christian "union," in the common acceptation of the term. But if we seek only Christian peace and harmony, a peace and harmony secured by an obedience on the part of each individual to the practical precepts of the Gospel, we shall be relieved from any such difficulty. We can maintain the kindest intercourse with each other in the midst of our differences, without being thought to give our sanction, even in appearance, to what we deem errors. Each individual will stand by himself, and will speak only for himself. Each in treating the other courteously will not thereby give his sanction to views he disapproves, but will simply manifest his own regard for the practical precepts of the Gospel. Nor will individuality prevent us from uniting, heart and hand, for the advancement of important objects of philanthropy. If we approve of the object, we may contribute to its advancement without being understood to express thereby our approval of every other person who may contribute to the same object. The Unitarian and the Trinitarian may unite in efforts to spread

the Bible or to advance the cause of Temperance, and may thus show, not that they agree in all points of Christian doctrine, but that they both alike approve of the cause for the advancement of which they have united. We may contribute to Missionary funds, not because we agree in religious opinions with every other person who contributes, but because we approve of the object and of the manner in which the particular mission to which we contribute is conducted. If we seek for Christian peace, rather than for Christian union, we shall escape the perplexities which often arise in regard to ministerial exchanges. It will be understood at once, that courtesy of treatment does not imply approval of opinions. We may recognize in others the rights which we claim for ourselves, — to form their own opinions upon their responsibility to their consciences and their God, and to publish them in their own way and without hindrance from us. We may give them credit for honesty in their opinions, even where these differ the most widely from our own, and for all of goodness which they exhibit in their characters, and thus we may seek to live in peace and harmony with them. But at the same time, and in perfect consistency of character, we may endeavor by fair argument to refute their errors, and may decline all active instrumentality in aiding them to disseminate what we regard as dangerous opinions. The whole subject of ministerial exchanges, in this aspect of it, is often misunderstood. No one minister may demand of another an exchange of pulpits, as a matter of right. It is wholly a matter of courtesy. And if so, exchanges cannot be regarded as tests of Christian fellowship; they will be regulated simply on grounds of expediency. We may admit a brother minister to be a Christian, and may entertain a high respect for his Christian character, and yet, on account of what we may deem errors in his opinions, or of infelicities in his mode of ministration, or of prejudices among our people which would prevent their hearing him with profit, we may deem it inexpedient to exchange pulpits with him.

In conclusion, we would observe that this subject seems to us to be eminently a personal and practical subject. Men have been too much inclined to look at it in its relation to communities and denominations, and not to

regard it as a personal matter, except so far as individuals may have felt themselves bound to carry out the plans of the denominations to which they belong. And this mistake has arisen from the circumstance, that men have thought of Christian union, rather than of Christian peace and harmony. But if we seek for peace, the subject becomes at once eminently personal and practical, relating to every man's daily conduct in his intercourse with his fellow-men. An individual, especially in the humbler walks of life, may feel that he can do but little to accomplish so glorious an object, as that of bringing the divided Church into a state of love and harmony. But still every one can do something. When one hears the views which he holds dear assailed, he may give that "soft answer which turneth away wrath," he may recognize the rights of others, and manifest a spirit of forbearance and of forgiveness towards all who may treat him unkindly; and in this way, by returning good for evil, by ever manifesting the spirit of Christ, he may allay the bitterness of those who differ from him, and impart much of his own spirit to those with whom he may associate. This gospel spirit of peace and love is to be manifested, not upon religious subjects merely, but in all the intercourse of life. We must seek for a spirit of devotion to God, of confidence in his wisdom and goodness, a spirit of personal holiness, a spirit of kindness to all around us and of ready forgiveness towards all who may oppose and injure us. These traits of character must be manifested in our business intercourse, in our political efforts, in our social circles. And then may we hope to maintain and manifest the same spirit amid all our differences of religious opinion. J. W.

Art. V. — SOCIAL INEQUALITIES.*

The social condition of England — what a picture of strongest lights and shades is called up in our minds by these words! And ever some darker lines are drawn in

---

* 1. *The Perils of the Nation.* Second edition. London. 1843.

2. *Remedies suggested for some of the Evils which constitute the Perils of the Nation.* London. 1844.

each successive delineation, as we receive it from those who have sketched but too truly from the real life before them. The boldest fancy here lingers far behind fact; official statistics present us with a tragedy too appalling to have originated in the wildest or gloomiest brain; and once more is verified the oft-quoted saying, so strikingly applicable to the present age, that "truth is stranger than fiction" — stranger, and sadder too. At no time is our faith in the progress of society more severely tried, than when we cast our eyes towards the land of our ancestors. It needs the most hopeful nature to predict any alleviation in the lot of the English poor — such are the fearful odds which they have to struggle against, and so radical must be the cure of their difficulties and distress, if any cure whatever shall be expected to succeed. Scarcely is any measure of relief proposed, before it is seen to be intimately connected with some principle equally or more important; so that we seem to be in danger of doing harm rather than good, unless we can carry into effect both and all benevolent plans at the same time. This is particularly true of attempts to improve the condition of the dwellings of the poorer classes. No reform could be more loudly demanded than this. "In England and Scotland," says Mr. Colman, "fifty thousand individuals perish annually by disease arising from the wretchedness of their habitations, owing to imperfect ventilation and the want of sufficient drainage." A large proportion of the two volumes, the titles of which we have given in the margin, is taken up with the most revolting details of the evils occasioned by the wretched abodes of the agricultural and manufacturing population in the United Kingdom. Perhaps no single physical cause produces so much moral corruption, as well as physical suffering. To show, however, the danger of partial remedies, the writer of these volumes cites the case of the cottages built on the estate of the late Earl of Leicester at Holkham, for his laboring tenants; some of which are represented by the Poor Law Commissioners, as being "perhaps the most substantial and comfortable, which are to be seen in any part of England." And yet, "the tenants of these admirable cottages, the well-employed, well-paid, healthy peasantry, thus beneficially cared for, are, on the showing of those best qualified to judge and report, discontented and

demoralized. Their moral condition is not superior to that of the inmates of a filthy hovel, — and the conclusion at which Mr. Twistleton arrives, after a minute investigation, is irrefragable: 'No external and mechanical benefits can supply the place of good moral training; and I should say as a corollary, that at the same time that you build first-rate cottages, you should establish first-rate schools.'" Unhappily a conclusion of this kind is often turned into an argument against any reformation of abuses. 'Why should we correct *this* rather than *that?*' is asked by some who are secretly averse to any change; a question which, as stated by our author, would finally resolve itself into the general principle, that "until everything can be done, nothing shall be attempted."

We have been deeply, though painfully, interested in these volumes. Much as we had heard, through various sources, of the wretchedness of the laboring classes in Great Britian, we were not familiar with the details of brutality, grossness, moral and intellectual stupor, disease, famine, and crime, which are here given. And these details do not seem to be in the least colored by imagination, but are too plainly verified in most cases by statistics of the highest authority. The author appears to us to be singularly careful in avoiding any embellishment, any distempered appeal to the passions or prejudices of particular classes, or any mere general harangue or exhortation. He writes like one who has no party ends to serve, but is solely and earnestly occupied with the removal of these astounding national "perils." He is filled with the deepest sympathy for the sufferers, and indignation against the authors and abettors of the social wrongs which he exposes, whatever may be the class of society to which they belong. Of his name and occupation we are not informed; nor is it material to know anything of his personal relations, since the facts which form the groundwork of his appeals and his plans scarcely in a single instance rest on his own testimony alone, but are established by the authority of well-known and authentic witnesses.

Our object is not to review these books, or their special subjects. The condition of England is sad enough to wring tears from the hardest heart. But we have no grief to waste upon distant wretchedness. It is too much like

feeding our sensibility with stories of fictitious sorrow. If "the food of hope is meditated action," so is it likewise with genuine compassion and benevolence. "Robbed of this support, it dies," or degenerates into the idlest sentimentalism. And still less would we palliate, as some seem to, any unjust institution or custom among ourselves, by the miserable plea that greater abuses prevail in a country which makes special pretensions to a philanthropic spirit. If every nation is to be judged by its ideal, we fear that by no means the lightest condemnation will fall upon ours. How many of the noblest hearts across the water have beat high at the name of American liberty! How few of those that have visited us, but have felt painfully the discordance between the name and the thing! Every new sound of wailing that comes from the mother country, instead of suggesting invidious comparisons, should rather induce a most anxious self-scrutiny. 'How is it with us? Are we tending thitherward by the same road? Or have we sufficient guaranties of social and political justice, to ensure us from similar calamities?' We are among those who could not answer the latter question in the affirmative; and hence the interest which such volumes as these have for us, as indicating the true cause and remedy for the like social "perils" among ourselves. The thoughts which have sprung up in our mind in contemplating these inequalities of social life, we propose now to give to our readers.

It is usually assumed as an unquestionable fact, that our era of the world is distinguished for the highest degree of civilization which has yet been attained; and few of us, probably, would dissent from the opinion, that England is the most civilized of all existing countries. But since it is also assumed that civilization and Christianity are nearly identical, we have the perplexing problem to solve,—how it has happened, that the most civilized nation on the globe is guilty of such systematic and legalized oppression, as would shame the worst form of Heathenism. The mere statement of this problem compels us at once to deny the proposition which gave rise to it. Civilization, if we are to accept the common notions concerning it, is *not* identical with Christianity. It is based on different principles and aims at different results; and we conceive that great harm

has been done by confounding two things so distinct in their natures. For if we examine the common idea of civilization, we shall find its chief elements to be great perfection in the fine and useful arts, facilities of communication, constant and skillful production of commodities, diffusion of domestic comforts, refinement of manners and literature, encouragement to all branches of industry, and the like; to which some would add as equally essential, a large measure of political freedom, and perhaps also, a general diffusion of the means of education. Now in this enumeration, unless we except the very last, we have nothing peculiar to Christianity, though undoubtedly many of these are characteristics of Christendom in a higher degree than they ever have been of Heathen countries. We need not therefore infer, that Christianity is hostile to social refinement, or the increase of temporal comforts. This inference would be as unsound, as that which supposes a Christian civilization to consist mainly of these outward advantages. We believe it can be shown, that there is a true idea of civilization which only differs from Christianity, as it is a partial and not a universal application of Christian principles, as it has reference to man in his social and political, rather than in his private circumstances. It may help us to a juster insight into the cause and cure of social inequalities, to consider first what is included in the true aim and purpose of civilization.

This purpose cannot, we think, be expressed in any less comprehensive words than these — the education of the race. In the liberal sense now attached to the word, education, we suppose no friend of humanity will deny this. That community which does not gradually tend, through its various laws and usages, towards the spiritual elevation of all its members, according to their several capacities, is as unworthy the title of civilized, as it is below the Christian measure. Were it otherwise, man's social nature would be a curse instead of a blessing to him. It were better for him to live in solitude, if he must "always descend to meet" the company of his fellows. But that imaginary "social compact" which some philosophers have feigned, happily has no counterpart in real life. We have not bargained for the surrender of any heritage, which we hold by virtue of our human nature. We have entered into

society only that we might become more fully men and women. This is the implied understanding of the social instinct; and the Creator's wisdom and benevolence are the pledges of its fulfilment. Such being the lofty aim of true civilization, we can understand why it has been considered necessary by some, that a people should be civilized before Christianity can be successfully introduced among them. The reason is, that the Christian teacher addresses exclusively the spiritual part of man; and though this may be a wise division of labor in the great school of society, it should not make us forget or undervalue the importance of the other branches, which belong more especially to the province of civilization. We trust that sounder views are beginning to prevail concerning the relation between man's physical and moral nature. As was somewhat quaintly said (though with too much levity) by a contemporary, "there is more connexion between soap and salvation than may have been thought." It is but a homelier phrasing of the "mens sana in corpore sano." Unless we become ascetics, and treat the body as the natural enemy of the soul, with whom no terms are to be kept, it should certainly be a prominent part of all liberal culture — for the individual and the race — to provide the means of bodily as well as spiritual development. How absurd to expect any great spiritual progress from those who are oppressed with incessant and unrequited toil, surrounded with almost every discomfort, worn and wasted with domestic cares, living in false and unjust relations to their fellow-men, dwelling in abodes that would hardly be deemed fit for the meanest of our domestic animals! These are extreme cases, it may be said. Alas! tens of thousands, who speak the same language with ourselves, are reduced to such extremities; but in any case they illustrate the point we would urge. The material obstructions to spiritual growth have often been too lightly estimated. It is indeed justly set forth as the aim of a true man, that he have a force in him superior to circumstances; that "in whatever state," he be able to maintain truth and love in his intercourse with men, and devout reliance upon God. But they who earnestly desire to have this aim reached, must see that their work is morally impossible,

while some of the inequalities of our social life remain.* Some rare spirit may be brave and content and loving, in the midst of extreme destitution; and another still more rare, may be humble and self-denying, though pillowed on the couch of utmost luxury. These are the marvellous exceptions to the ordinary course of things, exceptions which "prove the rule," because they are so marvellous.

The reason why men are slow to admit the fact, that spiritual destitution arises necessarily from physical destitution, is, that they fear to arraign Providence for injustice — assuming of course, that the privations and distresses in which so many spend their lives, are all providentially ordered! Was ever the name of piety so lent to the sanction of cruelty and injustice? Were it not better freely to allow all the facts in the case, if we would indulge the hope of diminishing the amount of human suffering and sin? Perhaps we may be led to conclusions, which are not quite creditable to existing institutions and customs of society. Perhaps, too, the office of the moralist may become somewhat blended with that of the statesman and the parish officer. Nevertheless we shall wink nothing out of sight, and may have the satisfaction of making some approach towards a solution of the darkest problem in which humanity is involved.

Civilization, we have affirmed, has for its true end, the education of the human race. The most civilized nation is that, in which every individual is thoroughly educated according to his capacity — not according to his circumstances. For these last should be such, in every instance, that full play may be given for the exercise of all the faculties in their just order and proportion; so that every one may be educated *by* his circumstances, not *in spite of* them. We hold this to be a very important distinction. Too often has it happened, that some of the warmest advocates of universal education would limit this reform by the social standing of each individual, instead of pressing

* "The physical condition of the working classes must be a primary element in every scheme for their moral improvement. There is a much closer connexion between the physical and moral condition of humanity, than is generally imagined. Is it not notorious, that in every great city the worst dens of vice are found, where the drainage is bad, and the supply of water limited?"— *Taylor's Natural History of Society.* Vol. I. p. 153. London Ed.

the further demand, as essential to perfect justice, that every one's social standing should be in accordance with his natural abilities and moral worth. The necessity which dooms genius to a life of drudgery, argues some injustice in the society where such a thing is tolerated. It is scarcely less than blasphemy to charge it upon Providence — however some may try to shield themselves from such an accusation, by pointing to the compensations of another life. Until the present life is proved to be an entire failure on the part of its Author, we cannot believe that a single human soul is sent here on a fruitless errand. It must have a purpose to accomplish worthy of its powers and proportioned to them; and if that purpose is frustrated by some cause beyond its own control, it must be owing to man's blindness or wickedness, not to God's decree.

But civilization, in discharging this great function of educating the race, does not by any means propose to dispense with all inequalities; for this would be undertaking to do away with natural differences — to make all men alike. Men are born equal, but they are not born alike. And if this simple difference had been remembered, much of the flippant declamation against the first proposition would have been spared, and many vain alarms about the "levelling system" would have been dispelled. It is only the most iron despotism that could reduce its subjects to the same level of condition. Wherever an equality of rights is granted, it follows of necessity that there must be a difference of outward circumstances as well as of character; for one of the most essential rights is, that one be free to exercise and cultivate his mind according to its original bent; and another is, that he be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his own industry; and both of these privileges would inevitably lead to an immense variety of fortune. Equality of rights, then, necessarily excludes equality of condition; but at the same time it does away with those monstrous inequalities, those mournful contrasts of condition, which we believe are always traceable to some infringement of natural rights. Who can imagine that equal justice is meted out to all, in a country where such extremes of wealth and poverty are found as we behold in England at the present day? Though it should be impossible to discover the real authors of the injustice, we are neverthe-

less persuaded at the first glance, that wrong has been committed somewhere, and the victims of this wrong give most manifest tokens that they have the same persuasion. "As late as the autumn of 1842, eight of the largest counties in England, and a great part of Scotland were in open insurrection."* Can we wonder that Lord Ashley should say; "The danger is wider, deeper, fiercer, and no one who has heard these statements, and believes them, can hope that twenty years more will pass without some mighty convulsion, some displacement of the whole system of society." Yet England is confessedly the richest and most powerful nation the world has ever known; and what is particularly to the point, her land is capable of supporting comfortably nearly four times her present population.† That such anomalies prove the existence of most flagrant injustice and cruelty, cannot for a moment be doubted. A land rich beyond all example — yet containing within its borders thousands of starving families! Shall they perish and no man "lay it to heart?" But starvation is nothing to the famishing of the intellect and the heart. Better they should die, than live with "the light that is in" them all quenched, every trace of the divine original as thoroughly blotted out from their natures as the malice of the arch-fiend himself could desire. "Alas! was this, too, a breath of God!"

We have no space, and no disposition, to enter into a recital of the painful and too familiar story of the "shame of England," much less to attempt an explanation of the causes of so unhappy a state of things. We are not writing a discourse of political economy. The "wealth of nations" is not our theme. We would essay the much humbler task of briefly examining by the light of Christian principles the institution of property, and the relation it bears to civilization, since it is the unequal distribution of this which gives rise to nearly all the unhappy differences between man and man in a civilized state; though it may perhaps appear, if we look at it more closely, that property is not so much the cause, as it is the effect and sign, of

* "Remedies for the Perils of the Nation." p. 13.

† This is within Mr. Alison's estimate. See his "Principles of Population," quoted in "Remedies" etc. p. 6.

social disparity. An inquiry of this sort, it seems to us, should hold a prominent place in Christian ethics. Considering the vast number of cases in which the right use of property involves the happiness and virtue of multitudes of human beings, we are astonished that it is not oftener made a question of the first importance with conscientious people, how they shall faithfully employ this talent which is lent to them, — that they so seldom go beyond the customs of the time to answer this question, and adopt with so little hesitation the style of living, the comforts or luxuries, which society deems them entitled to. This often arises, without doubt, from an entire ignorance of the claims which others have upon them and the wide means of influence which they possess in their wealth, an ignorance that may easily be enlightened by the statement of a few plain facts and inferences.

The right to hold property is justly regarded by most ethical writers as a primitive right, the recognition of which to some extent is essential to the existence of society, and the better security of which always marks an increasing stage of civilization. It should be observed, however, that this right may be very much modified by the definition of property. Were we to accept, for example, the definition of one of our own statesmen, that "property is what the law affirms to be such," we could not, *in foro conscientiæ*, establish the right to hold it, for the plain reason, that the court of conscience is not identical with a court of law. But while we reject a definition which would justify property in human beings, we must also deny, on the other hand, that property should be restricted to the fruits of our own labor — that simple production is the only fair title; for this would exclude from the definition, exchange, inheritance, appropriation, and the like; all or most of which could be easily shown to be important aids to the progress of human society, and therefore in accordance with the soundest principles of morality. But such a discussion would lead us far aside from our purpose. Our readers cannot need any arguments against a community of goods. The right to individual property in *something* is not often denied among us; and could never be denied, if it were remembered that property exists prior to all human laws, and is but the instinct of man "to impress his individu-

ality" upon external objects.* We may fairly assume, then, without further controversy, that every man is entitled to call his own whatever he has acquired without violating the rights of others. And this definition, we are aware, still leaves the right of property open to discussion, since we do not as yet determine when "mine" and "thine" come into conflict with each other. The further consideration of our subject may throw some light upon this point also.

It does not in the least invalidate the right of property nor is it any reasonable subject of complaint, that wealth is and ever must be the source of great power. We might as well complain that sugar is sweet or lead heavy. They who declaim against the undue influence of the rich seem to forget, that the blame rests not so much with the rich as with those who are willing to be governed by such an influence. If a man mistakes tinsel for pure gold, he has only his own dullness to find fault with. Wealth is coveted for the sake of those things which are purchased with it. Doubtless it can buy many things which one should be ashamed to barter for so mean an equivalent. It can buy smiles and bows and shouts, "chief seats in the market-place," and "to be called of men, Rabbi." But we may not deny, that it is also sought for nobler objects than these. The man of taste cannot bring himself to despise so important a medium of refinement — through the influence of literature and art. Books, paintings, and statues, reluctant as we may be to own it, can never become wholly independent of wealth. Even costly furniture and the ornaments of domestic architecture are not the offspring of mere display. They doubtless minister to the love of beauty, and often, we suspect, do their part to make home attractive to those who seem least dependent on outward resources. Shall we be thought to stoop, if we allow that even dress, that universal mark for satire and moralizing and sumptuary laws, is in some sort an expression of character; indicates not merely the tailor's skill, but the wearer's love of the graceful and appropriate, as well as a laudable desire to please by an exhibition of taste and beauty.

But wealth accomplishes far more than this as an agent of civilization. It is justly an object of desire to the phi-

* The expression is taken from Lieber's "Political Ethics." Part I.

lanthropist for its power to relieve human suffering — disease, ignorance, insanity, and pauperism. He must be a cynic of the hardest stamp, that can sneer at wealth in sight of some noble hospital which the charity of rich men or a wealthy State has founded. "Capital," it has been said with truth, "is the security against indigence, belonging not merely to the capitalist himself, but to every laborer in the community."* Among barbarians there is no relief for extreme poverty, but to die. "Death acts as the relieving officer." And the reason is, that there has been no concentration of property, no providence, no accumulation beyond the wants of the present moment. No one therefore has any thing to spare from his abundance to relieve the destitution of others; and the power of alleviation being deficient, the disposition is rarely felt. The charities of life die out. Every one aims to be independent of the rest; and where this aim is defeated, there is no resource but death. In proportion, too, as this self-dependence prevails, there is less true society. No man is bound to another by ties of mutual help or affection. Each is isolated, and men are gregarious, not social. Society becomes possible, only when the sense of dependence springs up in the mind — only when we cannot dispense with the tokens of good-will and affection, and the offices of friendship and charity. We then gladly acknowledge our dependence upon others, for others also are dependent upon us. We hope to impart as well as receive; and it is this interchange of gifts, spiritual and material, which constitutes much of the charm and benefit of true social life.

The connexion of these remarks with the subject of property is at once apparent. There are no inequalities in life which occasion so much envy and bitterness, as the unequal distribution of wealth. Far be it from us to defend the contrasts of palace and hovel, which shock the eye and heart in the large cities even of our own land. But our design was, to show that a certain degree of inequality in this respect may have a beneficial influence. We have always the poor with us. Do we not need them as much as they need us? Are there not relations between poor and rich, which, if properly regarded, would do honor to human nature? We are slow to appreciate these relations

* Taylor's Natural History of Society, Vol. I. p. 136.

in our country, because the confession of poverty is deemed the acknowledgment of a superior; and the genius of democracy forbids such acknowledgment. This is one of the greatest social defects in our system, a defect only to be cured by the spirit of the Gospel, which invests every man with a dignity unborrowed of fortune, and independent of it. For this spirit teaches us to respect character above all other distinctions; and in proportion as it prevails in society, the poor man will not feel degraded by assistance from the rich, nor will the rich man feel elated by his ability to render such assistance. Could it once become the general sentiment of the community, and not the mere hypocritical consolation offered by the rich to the poor, that spiritual gifts alone are of any permanent value, what a vast amount of envy on the one hand, and condescension on the other, would be expelled from social life? Nay the excessive inequalities, which give rise to this estrangement between the more and less fortunate, must themselves disappear speedily before the universal prevalence of such a sentiment.

And now perhaps we may attempt to define what we mean by excessive inequality, or rather to throw out some hints, by which one may define for himself where lies the boundary which he must not overstep. When we are asked, How far is inequality of property necessary in a just social state? — we do not consider it sufficient to say, that it is necessary so far as it is unavoidable, that is, so far as it cannot be prevented without some restraint on private liberty. For moral duty is far from being commensurate with legal right; and though this seems evident enough in the abstract statement, we shall find it practically contradicted many times, the ambiguity of language covering an equal ambiguity of moral perception. How often, for example, is any dictation or advice upon this very subject resented by the question: 'May I not do what I will with my own?' And the questioner seems not to be aware, that he shall receive two very different answers, according as his words are understood in a legal or strictly moral sense. 'You *may* do what you please with your own; because the law will permit you, if you commit no trespass on another's rights.' — 'You may *not*, as a moral being, do what you will with your own, unless your will coincides

with the requirements of justice and charity and self-denial.' The reason is, that nothing is so exclusively "our own," that we can disregard, without sin, the claim which some others of the human family have for a share in the use of it. "Of our very bodies we have only a life-rent." And what are all our possessions but so many trusts which we must faithfully account for? This is a familiar, perhaps a trite view of the use of property; but it applies to the accumulation as well as the consumption of wealth. There are moral limits to the right of acquisition. And it is the neglect of these, which occasions most of the needless and oppressive inequalities of life. Legislation can do comparatively little in putting any direct check upon individual accumulation, without encroaching upon private rights, and consequently introducing a worse evil than it removes. It may restrain the avarice of employers in manufacturing or other labor, for example, by limiting the age at which it shall be lawful for operatives to be employed; and it may impose some restrictions in trade, for the greater security against fraud. Some regulations of this kind may be and undoubtedly are highly necessary. But they can never go to the extent of preventing large and overgrown fortunes.* Any reflecting and candid mind may be convinced, we think, that there is no remedy for the evil from this quarter, however deeply he may feel that a remedy of some sort is necessary.

Yes, we must look to moral influences alone, to counteract this growing evil. We cannot but believe, as there is a conscience in man, that some may be induced to stop in their hot haste for acquisition, when they perceive, that not only is their own character in danger of losing somewhat of its spirituality by absorption in gain, but also their superfluities can only be enjoyed at the expense, probably, of extreme toil and scarcity on the part of some less fortunate individuals. For in order that one man may indulge in a luxury which is useless and even hurtful to him, many others must have worked for a miserable pittance; which is not the less unequal and unjust because their necessities

* We have omitted, in the text, the abolition of the law of primogeniture in our mention of legislative enactments, because, although this would be by far the most effectual step towards greater equality of condition, it does not apply to our own country, where no such law exists.

made them willing to receive it. It will not be difficult for any one to determine what is for him excessive accumulation, if he will consult the highest morality, instead of the maxims of political economy. Why is accumulation allowable at all? To answer this question, let us conceive of a society commencing life in some new world, with perfectly equal advantages guarantied to all. Each one is to be insured the enjoyment and disposal of the fruits of his own labor, so far as it does not interfere with the rights of another. There would of course soon arise inequalities, from the natural difference of personal ability. By superior industry, skill, and prudence, one man will produce more than another, and can thus lay up a portion of his wealth to provide against sickness and infirmity and misfortune. No Christian principle could condemn this accumulation beyond the wants of the present moment. On the contrary, it marks a culpable indolence and improvidence, not to reserve the means of support for one's family against a day of want. But whoever has thus accumulated, possesses an advantage over the improvident and careless. In a time of destitution, they are glad to give their labor in exchange for his commodities; and he is equally glad to make the exchange, whether to be relieved from toil, or to redeem leisure for mental cultivation. Here, then, commences the distinction between the laborer and the capitalist; and from this point, also commences the temptation to exceed the just bounds of accumulation. The consciousness of superior power, is itself a temptation to a selfish abuse of it. Labor becomes degrading in the eyes of him who is able to purchase exemption from it, and who sees that this privilege renders him an object of envy to those who are burdened with excessive toil. And then the mere love of distinction makes wealth to be coveted for its own sake, and so excludes the idea of any limitation, save that which is imposed by human laws or by the shortness of human life.

May not the temptations we have just named serve as beacons to point out the true course to every conscientious person, who is willing to be governed in this matter by simple right, without reference to prescription and usage? We have admitted the obvious advantage of wealth for purposes of philanthropy, refinement, intellectual culture,

and freedom from severe labor and corroding anxieties. It would be easy to expatiate on these, were it necessary to defend what is so seldom attacked. It is not Christianity, but asceticism which imposes a vow of poverty. But the Christian teacher cannot forget that the dangers of the rich were most pointedly and solemnly exposed by Christ himself; and the experience of every age confirms the justice of the exposure. He only can be safe from these dangers, who strictly limits himself to such accumulation as shall best promote the real advantages which wealth confers; and whose moral sense is never bewildered by the factitious splendor which dazzles the crowd. To such a person labor cannot be debasing; he does not wish to unman himself by refusing the healthful exercise which God ordained for all. Neither can he esteem it brave or generous, to sink into luxurious indulgence, which would alike unfit him for rough contact with the world and for sympathy with the harder lot of his fellows. He places, moreover, *this* important limit to his acquisitions: — he will not take advantage of the favorable circumstances which his position in society may give him, at the expense of those who may depend on him for employment. The rate of wages, he thinks, should not be regulated by the necessities of the workman, but by some fair estimate of the value of his work; and since any such regulation is confessedly impracticable by law, he will be all the more scrupulous that no cupidity or cruel parsimony shall stint his compensation to the laborer; for he "is worthy of his hire." — We should be glad, if we had room, to dwell much more at length on this last point. The practical effect of adopting this principle, we believe, would be a far greater equality of advantages in the pursuit of wealth. For it applies not only to the relation between the operative and his employer, but also to trade and commerce with their thousand ramifications. A single question, for self-examination, includes, perhaps, the substance of what we could wish to urge: 'Do I give an equivalent for the labor on commodities which I procure; or am I trying to obtain them for the smallest possible compensation?'

The "rights of man," however, include somewhat more than the right to fair wages. And if we would apply the most thorough cure for these social inequalities, we must

endeavor to impress deeply upon all, the sentiment of respect for man as man. It is in vain to trust to our political principles to effect this. The demagogue may profess to feel this sentiment, but with him it only means, respect for man as a voter. We have tacitly or openly interpreted the "self-evident" truth in the Declaration of Independence, as referring to political, not to social equality. It was a great step, undoubtedly, to declare so much as this. But when we ascend out of the sphere of politics, we see the far higher sense, in which all men are created free and equal. They are created free to use all their faculties, and are equally entitled to the use of whatever means are essential to their complete education. Whoever denies this, seems to us to charge God with injustice. For why should it be required of every human being that he become "perfect," if he have no right to such leisure and opportunity as are necessary to the free exercise of all his powers?

"Doth God exact day-labor, light denied?"

Nay, why should any soul be born into this world, if the Creator did not intend that it should have room to develop itself according to its original capacity? "Nihil agit frustra," — he does nothing in vain, — even a heathen could say. It is the most glaring impiety to believe, that the Divine Providence could destine any one to a condition of life which effectually crushes out of him all generous and lofty sentiments, and breeds the gloomiest discontent and despair. But we are instruments in the hands of this same Providence; and can we then be content to say, 'Let alone; time will correct these abuses, or self-interest will, or our political rulers will look to it.' Alas! such has ever been the excuse of the faithless and indolent. An Apostle, Paul, preached from quite a different text. "We that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak." For that very reason were we made strong. And if we, — whoever we are that feel the injustice from which our brothers are suffering, and how contrary it is to the design of a Good Being, — if we do not put our shoulders to this work, it will not be done. We talk of the healing power of *time*, as though "time" were some personal, concrete agency. We talk of self-interest, forgetting that however

enlightened it may pretend to be, it is ever short-sighted and blind. And we "put our trust in promises," as though all experience had not demonstrated it to be leaning upon a broken reed.

Let man be respected as man, for his intrinsic worth, instead of his outward trappings, and we shall secure perhaps all that is essential to social reform. To bring about so desirable an end, two things seem to us especially requisite, the first relating to individual, and the second to social action. First, we are to feel respect for character and worth, however concealed beneath outward distinctions, and then we can hope to impress this feeling upon others. The general manifestation of this sentiment would do more than all other causes, to dispel bitterness and estrangement between the more and the less prosperous classes of society. How much contentment, how much abatement of the eagerness to be rich, should we find, if poverty and a lowly condition were no bar whatever to the respect of our fellow-men, but all were uniformly treated with the consideration due to their personal merits. We are not so unreasonable as to expect or require that one's associates should always be chosen from sole regard to their intellectual or moral character. There are other differences among men, which, though they do not affect the more momentous interests of life, have necessarily much to do with our social intimacies. Congenial tastes and manners, to say nothing of more accidental disparities, make men companions; and doubtless it is manners more than morals which determines one's social rank. There is no injustice in this, if it do not lead us to withhold the homage to virtue and nobleness of mind, wherever it may be found, and whether invested or not with the grace of polite behaviour. Miss Edgeworth, we believe it is, has somewhere said, that "to be good and disagreeable is high treason against virtue." Let those be convicted of such a crime, whose external rudeness or coarseness has repelled men from the lofty principles which they have professed and practised. But they who could be thus repelled are not wholly guiltless of disloyalty to such a majestic presence. Had they been true subjects, they would have recognised their sovereign under any garb or in any place.

The other way in which we would hope to secure respect

for man independently of his fortune, is by providing universal education, by which all may be enabled and encouraged to develop their minds in a natural and just order. We are aware that this string has been harped upon to the weariness of many. Let it continue to be struck till there shall be no soul in the land but shall vibrate in unison with it. How can a republic, to say nothing of a Christian people, be better employed in their social capacity, than by constant and unremitted endeavors to place so great a blessing as education above the accident of birth and fortune? What a noble achievement, to have secured for every aspiring youth, thirsting for knowledge and expansion of mind and heart, the opportunity to quench this thirst at the living waters which shall flow freely for all who desire to drink of them! It can hardly be necessary to say, that our idea of education includes the most thorough Christian training; we have no faith in intellectual, or moral, or religious culture alone. Abundant examples — we could cite some from these volumes if we had room — prove the failure of any partial education. We rejoice that this is better understood and more frequently urged than formerly. It may awaken the slumbering liberality of the State or of wealthy individuals, when they become aware how much is demanded to carry out the true ideal of an educated Commonwealth. And they whose minds are most engrossed in plans for the removal of the contrasts between rich and poor, — who find the differences of condition to be chiefly important, — could take no more promising step in this reform, than by giving, as far as practicable, equal advantages of education to every class. The extremes of luxury and pauperism could not exist in a well educated community, because wealth would no longer be pursued with such insane and reckless haste. It would dazzle less. It would not vitiate the moral taste and blunt the moral sensibilities as it does now; but it would be sought for as one of the means, though far from the most essential, for the promotion of true social enjoyment and an approximation towards the ideal of a Christian society. W. S.

ART. VI.—RIGHTS, CLAIMS, AND DUTIES OF OPINION.

[An Address delivered before the Berry Street Ministerial Conference, May 28, 1845. By Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, D. D.]

THE relations into which men are brought by their opinions; the rights, claims, and duties of opinion; the rights personal, the claims reciprocal, the duties absolute; this is the subject, or class of subjects rather, on which I propose now to address you.

I suppose it is evident that we were made to think; that thinking in its very nature implies freedom of thought; and that from freedom of thought proceed inevitable differences of opinion. I suppose it is equally evident that opinion, the offspring of our thought, must be dear to us; that we cannot value our own opinion without disliking an adverse one, and that the expression of this disapprobation, if it is not inevitable, is at least a thing of simple sincerity. I suppose it to be undeniable moreover, whether we consult reason or Scripture, our own imperfection or the Divine commandment, that we are bound to entertain our own opinion with modesty, and to regard that of others with consideration and forbearance. Amidst these conflicting claims what is the just rule to walk by? What is charity? What is intolerance? What is persecution?

On these points there appears to be no little confusion of thought in the world. Persecution of opinion, for instance, is confounded with rejection of it; intolerance, with simple dislike; and charity, with good-natured indifference; so that you hear a man represented as a miracle of charity because he never spoke a word in his life against any sect, creed, faith or opinion whatever. Thus again, freedom of thought is sometimes held to be an immunity from all serious question; the right to think, to justify recklessness of thought; and the answerableness of a man to his own conscience, to exonerate him from all proper regard for the judgment of others. Thus the lawful tie to the past is nearly broken; the new-born thought of to-day, instead of careful and patient self-examination, has nothing to do but to get published; it is a piece of nature, let it come out; publication, ubiquitous publication of all that is in a man,—vagary, dream, nonsense,—is held to be the very sim-

plicity of wisdom. And thus opinion, the very lever that moves the world, is cast about as if it were a shuttle-cock for idle sport.

Let us attempt then, first of all, to clear up the ground of the proposed discussion and see what it is. And I think this may be in good part effected by a single distinction, which as a ray of light penetrates the cloud; the distinction, that is to say, between abstract right, claim or duty, and the use of that right, the actual deference to that claim, the performance of the duty. This is perhaps the most puzzling point in morals and religion. The abstract law that requires us to love God or to love man is very plain; but there is an almost boundless diversity in the actual modes of obedience; and the obedience is sometimes worst rendered where the bond is most felt. Men have dishonored God under the plea of love to man, and they have persecuted and killed one another for the love of God. But to come to the field of inquiry before us: — I have an abstract right to form an opinion, and in doing this I am necessarily governed by such considerations as present themselves to my mind; but does it follow that, freed from all moral bonds of self-distrust, faithful endeavor and love of truth, every exercise of the right to think is just and good, lawful and innocent? Much is said to this effect; but is it not said in disregard of a manifest distinction between the abstract and the actual? Abstractly I have a claim for my opinion upon the candor and forbearance of others; but suppose that my opinion were formed rashly, carelessly, under the influence of bad passions, from a desire to escape from moral restraints; would my claim suffer no abatement *then?* And if I were condemned, as I should deserve to be in such case, ought I to cry out, "intolerance! persecution!" It is my duty abstractly to value my own judgment on weighty subjects, and by consequence to regard with disfavor that of another which is opposed to mine; but upon this ground may I proceed to brow-beat his opinion, to lift up my hands in horror, and thus to cast a spell over all minds around me that shall lock up their faculties in bondage; to say, "anathema! maranatha!" as if I were an inspired Apostle; to act the Pope though I have rejected him, or having accepted him, to be myself still more a Pope? And if I do all this, am I to

shelter myself under the plea that it is my duty to oppose error? It was the very plea of the Inquisition. Doubtless I have a right to judge of the faith, the creed of another. Let not this be weakly denied; it is involved in the right to think at all. Nay more; I have a right to judge of the character, the disposition, ay, of the heart, the very piety of my neighbor. I must be a fool and certainly must act like one, if I do not. If I am to make no discrimination, how am I to conduct my affairs with any prudence? How am I to have any friendship or reserve of my friendship? No; I am to be lenient, but not blind. I am to be tolerant, but not indifferent. It is not judging that is forbidden, but a certain manner, feeling, spirit in my judging. When our Saviour says "Condemn not that ye be not condemned," it is a hasty, censorious, cruel judgment that he forbids.

Thus much with regard to the distinction between the abstract right to judge, whether of things or men, and the actual use of that right. It may serve still further to define the ground of our inquiry, to observe more distinctly that it relates to opinion, to a mere judgment of the mind. Opinion cannot be infallible. It cannot properly be legislative. It has no right to legislate for another's mind. When I go beyond absolute intuitions, I do not *know* that I am right or that another is wrong. I do not *know* that the infidel or the rationalist or the Calvinist or the Romanist in his theory is wrong. I may have the firmest conviction, but it is not absolute knowledge. This is a powerful argument for modesty and forbearance; but it is no argument for indifference. I judge as well as I am able. I obtain all the assurance of which the subject admits, all that God permits to my imperfect mind. I may well be in earnest then for my opinion; but I have no business to pronounce, to dictate, to speak with lofty authority, as if the matter lay in my mind in the form of absolute certainty.

From all this it results, in the third place, that in any just rule that can be laid down for the treatment whether of opinions or persons there must be a certain vagueness. It is so with all moral rules. If a man knew precisely what he ought to do in every moral emergency that arises, — precisely how much he should eat or drink, or how much he

should give in charity, or what exactly he should render to his neighbor in any question that arises between them, — the task of virtue would be comparatively easy. But there is no mathematical line for him to walk by, in relation either to honesty, or neighborly kindness, or charity, or candor. The spirit of every moral precept may be clearly enough ascertained; love, justice are capable of clear definition; but when it comes to their application to actual life, the case is not so clear. Now the principal errors in intersectarian law, so to speak, have arisen from an attempt to give it a precision that does not belong to it. As if opinions were fixed quantities, and the treatment of them an ascertainable ratio, men have proceeded to lay down creeds and to fulminate excommunications. If creed-makers and churches had simply said — which is all they were entitled to say — "we are of *opinion* that such and such things are true, though we cannot lay claim to absolute and intuitive certainty of it; and we must regard and treat with disapprobation all opposing opinions," then the minds of men had been left to a fair and useful conflict, without the establishment of absolute tests or the interposition of brute force.

We are now prepared, perhaps, to examine certain questions of great practical interest, that are either always arising between different sects, or that have recently arisen among ourselves.

In the first place, let us ask in general, — does Christianity require us to look at this subject from a point of view different from that of reason and common sense? For instance, does the reason of things say that we may and must treat opinions, differing from our own in a certain way, with a certain disfavor, and does Christianity say that we shall not? I must answer in the negative. If Christianity does take any such ground, it should be made distinctly to appear. Chapter and verse should be quoted for it. Somewhere in the record should be found a passage that speaks after this manner: — "no matter what a man *thinks* about Christ or the doctrines of Christ; no matter what he thinks about anything; all such considerations shall sink completely out of sight, in the relations that obtain between Christian men." It cannot be necessary to say a word, I

think, to free Christianity from the imputation of such manifest and monstrous absurdity.

In the next place, have Christian sects a right to condemn one another's opinions? Have Catholics and Protestants, Calvinists and Arminians, Orthodox and Liberal Christians, interchangeably such a right? Undoubtedly they have. Their very relation implies it. Nay, they have a perfect right to hold each others' systems to be a complete and even a fatal departure from Christianity. However much they may err in this, yet many of them doubtless, in sober seriousness and with the best lights that they can obtain, do come to such a conclusion; and they have a perfect right to come to it and to express it. If instead of the words, "condemning and judging" — words which bear a severe or a legislative aspect — we simply said "disapproving," or even "disapproving in the highest degree," the difficulty would be removed. Here is the fault; not in judging *of* doctrines and men — a thing inevitable — but in judging them. If any church or sect or man condemns another in a severe and haughty spirit; if their argument is the strong argument of the majority, and they are willing to make the most of mere numbers; if they endeavor to awaken horror towards their adversaries with a view to crush down all freedom of inquiry; if they subject them to pains and penalties; — then all is wrong on their part. These have been the great offences and evils of Christian intolerance. A simple, calm, modest, though solemn disapprobation, would have awakened no anger, and would have promoted inquiry.

Can there be any doubt that there is such a right? If a man may not decide what is *not* Christianity, then he may not decide what it is; then he is called upon to embrace as his religion, he knows not what. Even if it could be proved that Christianity proposes nothing to be believed, makes nothing of opinion, severs feeling from conviction, demands emotion without any regard to the views on which it is naturally and necessarily based — a supposition surely most irrational and incredible — yet even then the same question would arise, — what is Christianity? That is to say, what is the feeling which constitutes a man a Christian? And every man must be allowed to judge what it is, and therefore to judge what it is not. I do not see that

the difficulty is relieved by removing it from the department of speculation into that of feeling. There is naturally perhaps, and there is really, just as much difference about the latter as the former. Nay, and all Christian controversy is always brought ultimately to bear upon the latter point. Always the allegation is, — "your faith is so bad that you cannot entertain the true Christian feeling." No doubt too much stress has been laid upon speculative faith. No doubt it has been a great, a monstrous evil in the Church. But really I do not see how we are, for that reason, or for any good reason, to foreclose opinion from judging what Christianity is, and what it is not.

And I think it is worth considering, whether in arguing against the abuse of this right, we have not been led incautiously and unreasonably to argue against the right itself. We have contended, and justly, that Christians should be left to perfect freedom of thought, that Christian virtue is compatible with a great diversity of theological tenets. But we have not been ourselves very lenient judges of the systems around us. We have maintained that Christianity is overlaid and defaced by enormous, by dreadful errors. Nay I have heard more than one man say that he would rather be an infidel than a Calvinist, a strict Calvinist of the old school; and I must confess *that* is my judgment. That is to say, I can better get along with the difficulties of the infidel system — which, observe, is not atheism, nor universal unbelief, not a rejection of natural religion, but only of a revelation — I say, I can better get along in my own mind with the difficulties of this system, than I can with that of Calvin; embracing the damnation of infants, actual or deserved, and the just exposure from Adam's sin, of all men to that doom. I may be wrong, but this is my opinion. And if any one says I have no right to entertain such an opinion, I answer that I think I have; but that at any rate I cannot help it.

The truth is, all difficulty about such cases arises from a misapprehension of the *nature* of this judgment. Any judgment which one forms of another's faith is, and can be, I repeat, nothing else but an opinion. A creed is nothing but a collection and statement of opinions. If it is anything else, I should like to know what else it is. If it is not simply a thought, a judgment, a conclusion of men's minds, what is

it? There is a notion prevailing, that what is agreed upon in a conclave of clergy, is invested with some peculiar character; that it becomes something different from thoughts, beliefs, convictions; but what else can it be? "Ay," it may be said, "but suppose that to differ from that opinion be made penal; what *then* is it? What is the *law*, but an opinion, with a penalty annexed for disobedience?" I answer, the law legitimately has to do with nothing but actions, including of course the intent of the doer. But suppose the law should propose to determine what men should *think* about matters of speculation or taste, about philosophy or art; what men should *think* about their neighbors, friends, and families; then we should have a case analagous to that of legislation in regard to systems of theology. And then should we see that legislation has properly no more to do with theology than it has with metaphysics or chemistry.

Separating then the incongruous and injurious element, what have we left? Still I say, nothing but an opinion. With whatever solemnity, with whatever air of authority it may be invested, it is properly, purely, only that. A bull of the Pope, though half the world bow down before it, is nothing but an opinion. It did not drop from heaven; it was considered, revolved, excogitated in the mind of his Holiness before it was uttered; and it is worth just as much as his judgment or that of his cardinals is worth, and no more. The tenets of the Synod of Dort or of the Augsburg Confession, the Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, are nothing else but opinions.

If the subject had been regarded in this light, and then if opinion had been what it ought to be in imperfect minds, modest and forbearing, however firm and decided, all the terrible evils that have flowed in the train of religious speculations would have been arrested. Orthodoxy and heresy would have been comparatively harmless words; they would not have sown dragons' teeth in the field of the Gospel. Intolerance, persecution, the fire and the rack would have had no more to do with Christianity than with philosophy. Extract the false legislative element from opinion, and you would extract "the root of bitterness" from the bosom of the Church.

The questions which I have raised thus far, and attempted briefly to answer, belong to the general circumstances of all religious bodies or to the past condition of our own. But a crisis in opinion is now arising, which demands a more particular consideration.

A great question has presented itself, — the greatest that Christianity ever met; — is the record of it to be received as substantially true, or is it to be regarded as mainly a collection of fables and legends?

It is not to be regarded as matter of surprise, nor of regret perhaps, that this German question has come in among us. It finds its place in the actual progress of thought; and I have no doubt, that among minds accustomed to theological investigation many have encountered this question, and in the quietness and retirement of their studies have examined it, and have come to the stable ground of faith in the New Testament. And it was due to such a question, as it seems to me — it was due to one's own mind in such a case, to have paused some time, to have waited with some patience and self-distrust, and not to have been in haste to rush into the arena of publication; not to have disturbed men's minds, till it was thoroughly prepared to satisfy and settle them. But the thing is done; and I confess I am looking with great interest to see what treatment this question is to receive from Saxon hands. It is awakening some attention both in this country and in England; and I trust it is to receive a more satisfactory solution in these countries, than it has found in Germany.

I propose to offer some thoughts upon this question, because it is *the* question of the time, and in a meeting of clergy at this moment seems to have imperative claims upon attention. All former assailants of Christianity, or of what we have considered as Christianity, are mere pigmies, compared with Dr. Strauss. I think indeed that his arguments are capable of a most satisfactory refutation; in fact, he begs the question at the outset. But to grapple with such an antagonist, or to enter deeply and in detail into the merits of the question, is of course impossible in the brief discourse of an hour. What I have now to offer is indeed mainly on the practical side of the question. But I think that something may be properly and sufficiently said on the nature of the question, or the principles of

reasoning which are applicable to it, on the views which are likely to decide it, and on the spirit and conduct with which it is to be met.

Let me further observe, for the sake of keeping up the continuity and coherency of this discourse, that it is simply of opinion that we are to speak, and that in doing so we are to be governed by the natural laws of opinion. Opinion is not legislative, is not infallible, I have said; but it is nevertheless a right and every man's right, though it may be misused, and it is a Christian as truly as it is a natural right.

To proceed then, I ask in the third place, are we entitled to say what Christianity is or what it is not; what it is or is not to be a Christian believer, a Christian man. For I confess that I can make no essential distinction here. A good man one may be without being a Christian; many in the old time, both Jews and Gentiles, have been such. But for a man to call himself a Christian man, while he holds all the doctrines and facts associated with the Christ to be fabulous or nugatory, while he professes in his criticism of the Christ to look over him and beyond him and to see something better, seems to me as great a misuse of terms, as if a Chinese, while rejecting Confucius both as teacher and model, should still call himself a Confucian good man.

But to the question; I say, either we are entitled to have an opinion as to what Christianity is, or we are not. If we say we are not, then I do not see what further we have to do with the matter. Then every man is a Christian, who claims to be such. Infidelity, pantheism, atheism, may be Christianity; and nobody upon this principle can gainsay it. If we may not decide, if it is not perfectly proper for us to decide in our own minds, whether this or that be Christianity, or whether it be or be not something else claiming the title, I do not see why it was published, or how it can be the subject of any rational contemplation whatever.

But if we say that we can distinguish between the true and the false in this matter, then *what* do we say? Nothing lofty nor arrogant, I conceive, but simply that we are capable of forming an opinion, and that we have an opinion. Have we not a right to form an opinion and to act upon it; no right to be either rational or sincere? Why, the veriest

ultraist has an opinion as decided as anybody else, and he acts upon it. He says that the greater part of what we call Christianity is a mass of erroneous impressions and of absurd and incredible fables. He freely writes books and preaches lectures to show that. And when he has done all this, does he turn round upon the conservative, and cry "intolerance, persecution, fire and fagot!" because some one pronounces what *he* holds to be Christianity, to be a mere bodiless dream and fancy! Are all the rights of opinion then reserved for those who set all previous opinion, and almost all other opinion, at nought?

But it may be said, "whatever the abstract right be, yet ordinarily, when Christian sects pronounce one another to be no Christians, — the Romanist, the Protestant, the English Churchman, the Dissenter, the Calvinist, the Arminian, the Trinitarian, the Unitarian, — do you not hold that this is very unreasonable?" I answer that I do; and why? Because they all alike acknowledge the authority of Jesus Christ, and all sincerely profess to stand upon the same basis; that is to say, the New Testament record. The fundamental criterion of faith and practice with them all is the same. But what is the case that has arisen in these latter days — in Germany, in England and America? It is a case in which the authority and the record, by which we have been wont to decide questions, are completely rejected. "No," it may be replied, "not completely rejected. The authority of the absolute truth in Jesus is admitted." Did any body ever reject the authority of absolute truth? Did any one ever deny the extraordinary virtue of the Christ, or his inspiration, in the sense in which Socrates and Cicero received that gift? Did ever any infidel or Mahometan deny anything of all this? How are we to distinguish the believer in Christianity from the unbeliever, if our definition of the Christian disciple includes the infidel and the Mahometan? I do not or need not now speak as a partisan of one theory or another. I might speak as a mere looker-on, not caring which is right. I might even admit that Dr. Strauss is right, and all the rest of the world wrong. But I do not see how they can profess to stand together on the same basis; except as all religions stand upon the same basis. It may be said that God, the absolute religion, humanity are greater bonds than any other,

and I need not deny it. They are the foundation ideas on which the superstructure of Christianity is built. But they are not the Christian bonds. The foundation is not the superstructure. And he who had swept away an entire house from its foundations, might as well say, "I still live in this house," as he who has swept the entire, substantive, historic truth of Christianity, can say, "I dwell in the Christian economy." In Christendom he does dwell; and from the universal air around he may have drawn in some blessed inspirations of Christian virtue; something of reverence, gentleness, meekness, love, he may have learned from Jesus himself; the very infidel may; the very Mahometan might; and Almighty God, lenient to human errings, may accept such an one; I pretend to judge nothing of his future condition. But still, if I believe that it hath pleased God on the basis of natural religion to erect the superstructure of Christianity, to add, in great mercy, something to that natural light; if I believe that he hath raised up Jesus Christ to be a perfect model and authority to me, and hath surrounded him for confirmation of my faith with the majesty of miracle, I do not see how it is possible for me to regard *him* as a Christian believer or Christian disciple, who rejects all this. When therefore the Würtemberg Council of Education made the formal inquiry of Dr. Strauss, what claim he had with his sentiments to hold a Christian professorship, although he made a labored attempt to defend the consistency of his position with his book, I deem that the Council could do no less than pronounce his defence unsatisfactory and dismiss him from his office.*

And yet Strauss has been represented by one who knew him, as an amiable, and in manner a modest young man.† And doubtless there may be, of those who believe so little, better men than some who believe much more. Why then, it may be asked, shall they not be accounted better Christians? In this question, it seems to me, there is an entire confusion of thought. A Homeopathic physician may be a better man than some Allopathic doctor. Is he therefore an

* See a Treatise of Dr. Beard of Manchester, (Eng.) on Strauss, Hegel and their Opinions. p. 16.

† Reply to Strauss's Life of Jesus, by Professor Quinet of the University of Paris.

Allopathic doctor? A man who rejects all Government and refuses to obey it, may be a more quiet and inoffensive citizen than many who acknowledge it. Is he therefore a subject of that Government? Suppose that a man accounts the Constitution of this country to be a mass of useless and indefensible provisions, rejects the authority of the State, and holds only to some abstract idea of moral authority; — can he then be regarded as a supporter of that Constitution? Can he consistently hold office in such a State? Obedience under the ancient Covenant was better than sacrifice; — could sacrifice therefore be dispensed with? Could he be a Jewish believer or a Jewish practiser who rejected it? "Righteousness before Doctrine" is a good motto; and it has been well illustrated by one of our Brethren, whom nobody can respect more than I do; but I would ask him, is doctrine therefore to be held as of no account in the Christian system? And suppose it be proved that many doctrines have been unwisely and injuriously contended about, to the neglect of good deeds, of holy enterprises for the regeneration of the world, and that this has been a grievous and deplorable evil in the Church; yet when doctrinal beliefs are reduced to their *minimum*, is there no *residuum*, no result of the last analysis, no ultimate basis of belief or fact, on which Christianity reposes? Is Christianity nothing but a dream of goodness? — the solid, matter-of-fact, miraculous Christianity, that cleaved the heart of the world? Was it but a vague and vanishing idea, almost lost in the shadows of antiquity, that has come forth moulded into a mythic form by the hands of twelve illiterate Apostles, or of persons far less responsible than they; and with more than the power of twelve empires, has swept with majestic march through eighteen centuries of progress and has changed the face of an hundred nations?

In the fourth place, let me ask, what are the views by which this question is likely to be decided? I answer; — as a man thinks of God, as he thinks of the order of the creation, its law, its spirit, so is he likely to decide.

It is not for want of evidence in support of the supernatural claim of Christianity that it is rejected. No such claim can have more evidence than this. If the views entertained by any mind lead it to anticipate some special interposition for human help, it would doubtless fix upon

Christianity as fulfilling its prophetic hope. Or, to take lower and perhaps juster ground, if a man did not deem such miraculous interposition absolutely incredible, the Christian evidences would probably be found strong enough to overcome the natural reluctance to believe. There is such a reluctance; the order of nature irresistibly disposes us to look with distrust upon every fact that claims to be a departure from it. This reluctance, this natural distrust, Christianity is prepared to meet. But a previous and invincible decision in the mind, that a miracle is a thing incredible, neither Christianity nor anything else can encounter with the least chance of producing conviction. God himself, though he should work a hundred miracles clear as the sun before the skeptic's eyes, could not produce conviction, except by previously removing that obstinate prejudice. That is the fatal bar in the mind of Strauss. That, I believe, is the fatal bar in the minds of all who agree with him. Any one who will read his work, will see that he constantly goes on this presumption. The thing related is a miracle, he is continually saying; therefore it cannot be true. It would seem scarce worth while to have written a book against any particular miracles, after laying down the proposition that all miracles are things incredible.

Again, our views of the Supreme Being will naturally influence our decision on the point before us. I do not say now what are the right views. Nor do I claim all piety for the believing, nor deny it all to the skeptical. But it is evident that a filial, loving, confiding view of God will more incline the mind to receive Christianity as a special interposition, than a distant, cold and merely reverential view of him. The spirit which pervades a late work, entitled "Vestiges of the Natural History of the Creation;" a spirit wedded to order, to the extent that the whole book is a kind of special pleading for it; a spirit that apparently, instead of recognizing a paternal presence and care in the creation, looks far back upon the Supreme Power as having impressed upon all the elements of existence those laws which hold on their course like fate, and work out all possible results, even to the formation of man; such a spirit, I say, though religious and reverential, must be unfriendly to the reception of Christianity as a special revelation.

Now here are principles of reasoning in the case. Which are the right principles? The presumption, on the part of a creature so ignorant of the Divine plan and will, that a miracle is impossible, — that any departure, not from the ultimate laws of the Divine wisdom, (which is not maintained,) but from the visible order of things on earth, is essentially incredible; the assertion that no case can possibly arise, in which God may so interpose; is it philosophical? Is it reasonable? Is it tolerable? Is this being, omniscient? Does he know every case, every emergency, that can possibly present itself in a free moral creation? If he does not, then in that emergency may be found place for a miracle. And he who pronounces it incredible, seems to me guilty of a rashness, of a presumption, to say the least of it, wholly unwarrantable and unbecoming.

The author of "Vestiges of the Creation" asks, which supposition better comports with the dignity of a human artificer; that he had made a machine which should go on without interposition to the end, fulfilling all its purposes, or one which should require to be touched and regulated from time to time? And then, misled by analogies, he applies this to the Infinite Being. And yet he complains of anthropomorphism in the reasonings of other men! I cannot account this to be true philosophy. The writer, though a bold, seems not to me a sturdy, inductive reasoner. Nay, his analogy, his favorite principle, fails him here. Man is not a machine; his will, by its very nature perhaps, is, to a certain extent, a disturbing principle in the creation; and it may create emergencies requiring interposition. Neither are we to think of God as if he were altogether such an one as ourselves.

But how, let us inquire a moment further, *are* we to think of Him? What especially are the moral emotions, the spiritual affections, that we are justified in feeling towards him? — for these too are among the principles of our reasoning. Suppose that our spirit is in perfect sympathy with nature; what will it be? What does nature teach? An infinite, paternal, minute direction and care seem to preside over it. Earth, air, sunshine, nay more, almost a visible love and joy breathing over the world, seem to demand of every creature a sympathizing confidence. Very instinct yields to it: shall not reason then?

Nothing is neglected. The cry of the young ravens is heard; the insect in the hedge is a vocal, a singing wonder of goodness; the motes in every drop of water bathe in an ocean of beneficence. Is it not a filial feeling then that man may entertain towards that Infinite Goodness! I may be wrong, but so it is that nature speaks to *me*. I cannot go out into this summer world without feeling that a care, a love, a pity, a thoughtful and provident love and care are all around me; that help is near to every creature; that a bountiful hand is opened to every want, and a strong arm is stretched out for all weakness. And if for every creature there is help, is there none — are we obliged to presume there is none — for man? Majestical in faculties, solemn in musings upon things great and wonderful, but humbled too, and almost overwhelmed beneath their grandeur; broken in spirit oftentimes, blind and erring, sinning and sorrowing, and almost instinctively asking, who shall deliver; — I am trying to make no strong case, I am but feebly saying what we all feel; — and I ask, is it an offence, in such an one — an offence to nature, to reason, to heaven, to lift his eye to the Infinite Being in hope that he will send some great salvation from his presence? This is the question; and I cannot but think that the true principles of the strictest reasoning put no obstacle in the way of that hope, but leave the path perfectly open to the ground of the great Christian argument.

In the last place, what are the spirit and conduct with which this great question of the day is to be met?

On this subject there is a difference of opinion among ourselves; and no little reproach is cast upon us, or upon the most of us, by others.

To notice in the first place the reproach from others; it is said that we are acting in total inconsistency with our former professions; and I suppose that the doctrines of this discourse will be accused of the same thing. I am not particularly anxious to deny this charge. All progress is likely to be made at some expense of consistency. I am much more concerned to be right to-day, than to show that I was right last year, or ten years ago. Very likely there are some things in our writings as a denomination, which are not entirely reconcilable with our present position. But after all and in the main, is this charge of inconsistency

just? Can it be fairly made out? Because we said that we as a religious body had not departed from the ground of Christianity, does it follow that nobody can? We surely never said, that, let a man think what he would about Christ and Christianity, he was to be accounted a Christian believer and disciple. *This* should be proved, before the charge of inconsistency can be sustained. Then again, it is said that we have discarded all creeds, that we have no creed and never had any, and have no business to act as if we had. No creed! What is the trouble now, but that we *have* a creed, that we *have* a faith, and hold it so dear that we submit to the exceeding pain of refusing to hold ministerial fellowship with that system of speculation which denies it? No creed! Is any one so simple in his unreasonableness, as not to see that the rejection of any one system, of any one doctrine, *implies* the acceptance of its opposite? This old, stale, self-refuting charge — have recent events given it any color? "Yes, but you said that all men should be left to judge of Christianity for themselves?" Do we say anything else now? And suppose a man, in judging of Christianity, should arrive at the complete rejection of it and should profess himself in terms to be an infidel; did we ever say that we should account him to be a Christian?

But this, it will be said, is not the case in hand. The case that now presses itself upon our attention, is one in which the party rejected wishes to be called a Christian believer and to be received as a Christian teacher. This raises the question on which there is some difference of opinion among ourselves.

I must speak of this question frankly, but I approach it with modesty; I may be wrong; I have no *ex-cathedral* judgment to pronounce, no consistorial decision to promulgate; I have only an humble opinion to offer. This is all, I am persuaded, that any one has thought himself entitled to contribute to the decision of this painful question. There is an idea abroad, that there have been certain consistorial meetings among us, to pronounce sentence upon a dissenting brother. But in truth there have only been certain informal meetings for mutual enlightenment. And I am willing, I wish, that the very heart of those conferences, every thought and feeling, could be laid open; for I

know that they would vindicate our old claim to candor and charity. There has been no authority assumed in the case, no invasion proposed or desired of another's freedom; nothing but respect for another's right of opinion; nothing but tenderness of conscience seeking to know what is right. Nothing in language or manner or spirit has resembled that assumption, common in religious bodies, of being undoubtedly right, and having nothing to do but to reclaim an erring brother. More large, more liberal, more modest and kindly has been the thought that has prevailed among us. And I confess for myself, that there is a picture of charity and forbearance, that strongly inclines and almost wins me to a judgment different from that to which I have come. We are all erring creatures. When the cloud of life shall be lifted up and shall open the vision of eternity, we may all find that we have contended for things unnecessary. "Why shall we not, then, bear with one for a while, and mingle together in the offices of religious instruction, no matter what our differences be about Christ and Christianity?" I wish with all my heart that I could take this view of the case.

But there is something higher than mere kindly feeling, by which we must be guided. And I would beseech the most aggrieved person in the case, to tell us what with our views we *can* do to satisfy him. Controversialists seldom look at a subject from each other's point of view. Let this justice be done to our position, and we ask what other we *can* take? We preach an authoritative and miracle-sanctioned Christianity. How can we unite in teaching with him who abjures all this, razes the very ground on which we stand, and preaches only Natural Religion? Suppose a lectureship were established for the explanation and defence of the American Constitution;—could two men give alternate lectures there, the one of whom regarded it as a binding instrument, and the other, discarding that view, proposed to speak only of the primary and absolute idea of Government? How could such dissentients with regard to the Christian bond, meet together to enforce it? What would become of Christian congregations, when taught such distracting theories? What would be their chance of edification and establishment? Why, upon these theories we cannot even read the Scriptures in each

other's churches. If I were to read the New Testament in a meeting of the disciples of Strauss, must they not look upon me as a weak brother, smile at my credulity, and wonder that I should gravely read such things to them? And if their teacher should read that book in my pulpit, would not the people look upon him with surprise and feel as if it were scarcely proper or honest to do this? Can we then preach the Gospel together, who cannot even read it together in our congregations?

Those among us who advocate ministerial intercourse with a denier of Christ's authority and miracles, still hold the same views as their brethren of the *denial* in question. They hold it to be a complete departure from the substantial ground of Christianity as a system of religion. They regard it as theoretical Infidelity. But they say that the *denier* does not so regard it. But by whose judgment of the matter are they to be governed? By theirs, or by his? By whose judgment ought he to ask them to be governed? On what ground, I say, shall they stand? On the ground of their opinion, or of his opinion? If he looked upon his disbelief as they do, I think he would not ask for participation in the teaching of Christianity. And can they consistently do what he could not consistently ask? I will make nothing of mere numbers in the case. I will suppose *myself*, and not my brother, to stand alone. And I say, if I and others had agreed upon a certain text-book as the basis of our teaching, and then if one or all of them had rejected that book, I could not unite with them in teaching; or if all of them held it as of authority and I did not, I could not unite with them. There could be no union obtained but by sacrificing the book, or by holding it to be of little importance, or by merging it in some more general teaching. And in truth this is the question before us. Shall we merge Christianity in Natural Religion? This is what ministerial exchanges in the case would say; this would be the public significance of the act, on the part of those who believe in the Christian records; — that, although believing in them, they hold them to be of little comparative importance, and are willing to merge the whole of what they consider to be the Christian peculiarity in the general sentiments of religion.

Besides, can it it well be expected of me, that I should

welcome into my pulpit a person who holds in something very like contempt so much that I revere? For it is vain to deny that this is the tendency, and must be the result of the late anti-supernatural speculations. Fable is never very respectable; but fable when raised to the character of solemn faith becomes, by necessary contrast of ideas, absurd and ridiculous. There is another respect in which my reverence is yet more deeply wounded. There are differences of which I can think lightly. But he who lifts his finger to the great and venerable ideal before which I bow down, and speaks of the divine and anointed Christ as a remarkable genius, an extraordinary Jewish youth, who yet erred sometimes in doctrine and practice, who is subject to criticism and censure, who was tinged with Jewish prejudices — thought himself the Messiah perhaps, or was willing to assume the character, (a fault venial in a young man;) can he be welcome to take part with me in the holy ministrations of the pulpit? If I were wrong and he were right, yet I do not see how it is possible for us to stand together. If a man but assailed the good name of my dearest friend, I should deeply feel it; and at any rate too deeply, to be willing to take part with him in a eulogy over that friend's grave.

Alas! here is a difference that the opponent will not see, and perhaps cannot appreciate. He has passed into another hemisphere of thought and feeling with regard to Christianity, and he does not know what is thought and felt in ours. But the difference is immense. And it is no new thought of to-day that makes it so; at least with me. I have long meditated in former days the question that is now propounded among us; it was the meditation and the painful struggle of years; and at length I came to the conviction — from the largest views I could take, from the lowliest prayers and the deepest searchings of which I was capable — that God, who speaks through the realm of nature and humanity, hath yet more especially, hath miraculously "spoken to the world by his Son." From that hour, next to a belief in God and in his goodness, this has been the most precious conviction of my life.

Can any one fail to perceive how momentous this conviction must be to him who holds it? We lift our eyes to the universe of worlds. Eternal laws penetrate through the

infinite realm. Wisdom, goodness, beauty, grandeur are around us; but as it all exists to us in the mind's conception, so its interest to us all centres in the soul's hope. Shall we live hereafter to behold this glory? Or are we to be swept down to silence and death, only to give place to other successions of being? — for that is the visible course of things. From the infinite order, from the infinite silence, hath God in mercy spoken to us? This terrible bond of fate — may we believe that it is broken by an articulate voice? This awful sovereignty — may we believe that it condescends to our weakness and listens to our cry? May we believe, not merely that God hath sent all elements and powers upon eternal, say rather inexorable errands, but that as a Father he presides and is present in all worlds, and graciously interposes in the moral fortunes of each one according to its needs? And is Christianity such an interposition? Is Christ the anointed and blessed messenger to *this* world? Is he only some imperfect, ordinary Jewish Socrates? Or is he, in some far higher sense, our Saviour? *Is* he this, or is he *not*?

Nor is this question momentous to individual minds only, but to the moral interests of all mankind. Opinion lies at the bottom of the world. All action is its result. The world is but the bodying forth of opinion. All history, empire, literature, society, life, is but the incarnation of it. But of all opinions I know of none more important than those which relate to Christ and Christianity, And most especially important are they in the present crisis of human progress. The world is about entering upon a new career. The bold speculations, the struggling passions of men are about to be let loose in a new and fearful manner. What is to control them? If Christianity is to be merged in that Natural Religion whose defects it came to remedy; if it is the mere scaffolding to the temple of truth, now to be taken away and to disappear; then the world must go on without that guidance that has been necessary to keep it in less perilous times. Science too is presenting aspects and tendencies that increase the need of this guidance, this instruction from on high. Under the name of order, it is bringing back a fate into the universe. It is threatening men with a new orphanage; it is bereaving them of the Father in heaven. It is not *true*, I conceive, that Christ-

ianity was only or especially needed in an earlier and ruder age. It is needed now, and never more than now. The world, in some quarters, in some departments of thought at least; in the young especially, in the young America, the young England, the young Germany — for this is the sort of phrase that is used to describe a phasis in modern humanity; the world, I say, is growing skeptical, infidel, pantheistic, bold, indocile, rebellious to authority and estranged from trust. And the word Father — Father in heaven — that which was so familiar on the lips of Jesus — that is the great word that needs to be uttered now!

In fine, let opinions fairly unfurl their banners, and not fold them into cloaking veils about the momentous points of difference. Reformers — as they consider themselves — must somewhat sturdily take their ground. They must not wonder at resistance nor rejection. They must let other people think too, and say what they think. They must expect opposition and learn calmly to meet it. They must not construe opposition into unkindness. *Let* there be no unkindness. Let the trial of this great question come; and let it be sustained patiently, gently, charitably: and may God, the Infinite Wisdom, the Solemn Judge, graciously guide his creatures right!

ART. VII. — CHURCH MUSIC.

EVERY person who, convinced of the duty and conscious of the happiness of cultivating religious affections, keeps in mind the design of public worship in its various departments to aid in this holy work, is disposed to inquire, What can be done to render the services of the temple more conducive to their high object? This inquiry has often been made, and the subject discussed by the ministers of religion, and others who sympathise with them in the work in which they are engaged; and the general reply is, "Let those who lead in public prayer be more devout than they usually are, more appropriate and more earnest; and in their preaching, let them address themselves, not less to the understanding, but more to the hearts and consciences of

their hearers." This reply is good so far as relates to him who occupies the pulpit; and for several years past a change has been taking place, which affords much encouragement for the future. There is, however, another branch of social worship, or what should be worship, whose aim is directly and solely at the heart; and which, of course, may greatly aid or counteract the influence of the pulpit. We mean the music of our churches, as it is in itself, and as applied to sentiment and verbal expression.

That the proper end of church music is to warm and quicken the better feelings of the heart, and deepen the impressions already made by the reading of the hymn or other composition to be sung, no person of serious reflection can reasonably doubt; and yet the music of God's house is often such, either in substance or in the style of performance, as might lead the unthinking to regard it as they would an interlude in a theatrical performance, intended only to relax the mind, and give a feast to the senses. We appeal to every person of musical taste and devout feeling, whether this be not a general fact. Happy exceptions indeed there are; but alas, how few! How seldom are our devotional feelings in a better state at the close of the musical performance than they were at the beginning!

From long attention to this subject, it appears to us that several faults and defects in our psalmody, with their appropriate remedies, might be pointed out, which, if they have received any attention whatever, have not been treated with the frequency and earnestness to which they are entitled.

Musical expression, as applied to public worship, must in general be gratifying to the ear, or it will not produce the moral effect intended. If, in any particular instance, the object were to aggravate remorse or any painful feeling of the heart, perhaps it might be most effectually done by dissonance, or some unpleasant modification of voice; but the devotion of real Christians is, or should be, a delight, one of the highest enjoyments; and, of course, the means by which it is produced should, in all their bearings, both immediate and remote, be of an agreeable nature. Hence the indispensable importance of cultivating both the voice and the ear to such a degree as to secure, if possible, perfect harmony and melody in every musical per-

formance in the house of God. But how seldom are the several parts in harmony one with another! How seldom do we hear anything like melody in any single voice! We have had too much experience in these things, and know too much of the occasional difficulties that may occur, to judge severely of any performance. The best trained choir, especially with a mixture of instruments no better than ordinary, are liable to find themselves out of tune, and particularly in a long series of exercises, which allow little opportunity for correction or adjustment. We refer to habitual defects, which mar, to a greater or less degree, all the performances of most of our choirs.

In every art there are rudiments, which must be thoroughly learned, in order to success in the practice of that art; and what the alphabet is in reading, the fundamental rules in arithmetic, and the use of tools in mechanical employments, is the formation of the voice and the ear in the education of a vocal musician. The voice must be modeled to a ready production of the most agreeable sounds, and the ear to as ready a perception of every defect, either in harmony or melody. It is true there are voices which are more melodious, either from the original perfection of the organs or the influence of favorable associations, than some others can be made by any cultivation whatever; and the like may be said of the ear. This, however, is not generally the fact. Natural defects, or the influence of rude customs and habits render, in most cases, special training indispensable to both.

The sensibility of the ear to the difference between harmony and dissonance is to be attained chiefly by exercise in favorable circumstances, and those circumstances are under the control of the instructor. What is necessary as a pre-requisite is, that the voices be well formed and well polished, and that the quantity of sound be generally small, or certainly not very loud. If the voices, composing what should be harmony, be flat, rough and loud, the discernment of the ear will be rather injured than improved by them. In such a case there may indeed be some harmony; but at the same time there must be, as we shall presently show, a great deal of discord; and it is often difficult to say which is predominant. There is an analogy among our various faculties and powers in respect to the best

means of quickening their sensibility, or discernment. As it is not by bringing together pungent flavors, that the discernment of the palate is to be improved; nor by the juxta-position of strong and distinct colors, that the connoisseur in painting is to be formed; so it is not by loud and rough noises that a delicate ear for music is to be acquired; but exactly the reverse in all these cases.

We have already suggested that round and smooth voices are indispensable to the perfection of harmony in vocal music, as well as to the proper training of the ear; yet few instructors seem to have any apprehension that these things require systematic attention. It is indeed a frequent injunction from masters to pupils, to open their mouths in singing; and the direction is substantially good; but it is too vague, without the application of effectual means for establishing the habit of giving as much rotundity to the passage of the breath as the verbal sounds will admit.

In the ruder circles of society, and in some of those which claim to be refined, there is a great deal of flatness in the sounds that are uttered in conversation. This habit must be corrected, in order to form a good singer. It arises from the want of opening the mouth to a sufficient width, or placing the tongue at such a distance from the palate, as to allow the rounder and fuller sounds a proper passage. All sounds, produced either by animate or inanimate organs, take their form from the passage through which they are emitted, just as much as streams of water. This we know from the different stops of the organ; and it may be learned from a strict observation of the position of the lips and the tongue, in uttering different sounds by the living voice.

What, then, is to be done in order to remove the evil we have described? To this we reply, let every person who offers himself as a musical instructor, first be sure that he is a complete master of the English language, at least so far as pronunciation is concerned; and let him constantly enjoin on his pupils to give every vowel and dipthong as open a sound, or, in other words, as round a form, as it will easily admit, correcting them whenever they fail, and that by his own example. If the words be well pronounced, they will of course give that form to the voice, that per-

manent form, which will be most favorable for receiving the necessary polish; and thus prepare it for blending most harmoniously with other well trained voices, or with instruments.

We have said that voices must be polished, or smoothed, in order to render them capable of perfect harmony. Such is the connection between the effect on the ear and the means by which it is produced, that a perfect illustration may, as we think, be taken from material things. Two or more blocks of granite or marble, as they are split in the quarry, may be laid side by side, or placed one upon another, and still may touch at very few points; but if well hewn, much more if polished, their contact will, so far as our senses can perceive, be complete. Or, to use another illustration, well polished sounds are like different streams of water, flowing and mingling together; or like the different colors in the rainbow, which, though each has an unchangeable identity of its own, melt into and embrace each other in such a manner as to produce the perfection of beauty. Such is the harmony of well trained voices. But how little are these things regarded by the greater number of musical instructors! What wonder, then, that our ears are often pained, where we look for pleasure, and that the fire of devotion is damped, if not quenched, instead of being kindled into an ardent flame?

If any still doubt the accuracy of the views we have expressed, they may be referred to experience, or at least to experiments which may easily be made. Our opportunities of observation have not, indeed, been very extensive; but from known principles in phonics, we suppose we shall be safe in affirming that, other things being equal, the perfection of sounds produced by sonorous instruments of all kinds, will be proportionate to the uniform purity, density, size and outward polish of each component part. A glassichord, worthy of the name, could not be composed of glasses formed of common materials, and with ordinary labor and care. Every diversity in the mixture of the ingredients, as well as in the thickness of the glass and the evenness of its surface, would affect the elasticity and consequently the vibrations; so that no single glass would be in harmony with itself. Instead of one uniform series of undulations, there would be many discordant ones.

Ordinary *wires*, however well adapted to each other as to their general size, would not produce the effect of a well-toned piano-forte. Everything that tends to disturb the uniformity of vibration must be guarded against. We think it may be observed, that the notes on those strings in the bass-viol, and those wires in the piano, which, in order to increase their gravity, are wound with a small wire, are less smooth than other notes, and hence in part, we suppose, arises the greater difficulty which persons of imperfect hearing find in tuning them. The unevenness in the surface prevents in some measure that unity of sound, which is necessary to make it harmonize perfectly with any other sound. One additional remark we are strongly tempted to make, though it may seem to carry us too far from our principal subject. A good church bell may be regarded as one of the noblest of musical instruments. Every stroke produces not one solitary sound, but, as every discerning ear testifies, three or four different sounds, at musical intervals from each other, which harmonize in proportion to the perfection of the bell. If the materials be good, properly mixed, and cast with a uniform thickness and a common degree of smoothness, the harmony will be good; but we have no doubt that any society, which could easily be at the expense, would find itself amply rewarded by the improvement the bell would receive, if thoroughly smoothed and polished in every part affected by the vibration. The harmony of such a bell, if not disturbed by the dissonant sounds of others, would be like the best preludes to public worship, played on the finest organ.

What is the difference between vocal and instrumental music? Doubtless it consists in this; — while the latter has a general tendency to produce a particular feeling or combination of feelings, the former operates more definitely and more powerfully, in consequence of the sentiment with which it is combined. This, however, depends on a perfect harmony between the music and the thoughts in their bearing on the heart. Instrumental music, or music in the abstract, has an influence on the feelings, and may produce a great variety of impressions, more or less intense according to the simplicity or unity of the composition. If it

were not so, it would be folly to think of combining it with poetical expressions of sentiment or thought.

If the difference between vocal and instrumental music be what is stated above, another question may naturally arise; is the music which is generally heard in our churches entitled to the name, *vocal?* Is there generally a combination between the music, and the hymns or other words to which it is professedly applied? Is the language, are the thoughts, so far regarded, as to be presented with any adequate distinctness to the hearers? With very few exceptions, so far as our observation has extended, these questions must, we think, be answered in the negative. Seldom do we hear a choir speak their words so distinctly, that a person with no other means would learn the sentiments of the hymn or anthem; and it is sometimes found that, with the words before him, a person is liable to lose his place, and to experience great difficulty in finding it again from any word he hears from the choir. In our apprehension, this neglect of audible pronunciation is to be much regretted, if not severely condemned; and it may be well to inquire how it happens, and how it is to be remedied.

We suppose that different persons fail of distinct pronunciation in singing on three several grounds. First, there are those who designedly suppress the consonants, by which, as much perhaps as by the vowels, one word is distinguished from another, in order to give greater smoothness and harmony to their notes. Another class, and that a more numerous one, are probably too indolent and unfeeling to give sufficient activity to the organs of speech. And a third are too little acquainted with the nature of language and the combination of verbal sounds, to surmount the difficulties that frequently occur in giving sufficient distinctness to the words without injuring the musical tones.

In regard to the first class, it must be conceded that they are right in softening their articulations, as far as may be consistent with an intelligible utterance of the words and the thoughts; but we do not see how they can for a moment justify a total, or even a partial sacrifice of sentiment to such a refinement of the music as the occasion does not require. If such a sacrifice must be made, away with all voices, and let us have nothing but an organ, or a few of

the softer and more perfect instruments; which, with less trouble and expense, would give us music more harmonious than we are likely to obtain from a miscellaneous choir. Let us not, however, be misunderstood. We prefer living voices, though some of them may not harmonize with others, because we want the specific and powerful effects which may be produced by the clear utterance of sentiment in connection with musical tones.

So far as a defective pronunciation in singing arises, or is supposed to arise, from listnessness or apathy in the performer, it is almost superfluous to say that it can have nothing but a chilling effect on the worshipper. It is a matter of universal experience that a *speaker* who is thus indifferent, if he do not disgust, lulls those, who should be hearers, into sleep. Such singing especially, as it is generally deficient in musical, as well as verbal animation, might serve as a lullaby at the side of a cradle, but it is wholly unsuitable for the house of God.

We have supposed that many singers fail of distinct pronunciation, because they are not sufficiently acquainted with the nature and combination of verbal sounds, to combine them with the musical tones without too great a sacrifice of smoothness and harmony. Hence it is to be recommended, that every student in vocal music should make himself thorough in the rudiments of the language that is to be employed; we mean, the sounds of the several letters. If this be done, every difficulty will be removed, where the choir is purely vocal, or where the voices predominate, as they always should do, over those instruments, which, as they cannot utter words, should be so used as not to obscure them. There is a great deal of what Dr. Franklin calls stammering in vocal music; and what is stammering, but the repetition of the same sound? For instance, we frequently hear syllables, which come on two notes, each sung as if written in this manner, *ma-ake, hi-igh, no-o,* and even *bow-ow;* and on slurs of three notes, *ro-o-oar, show-ow-ower, fi-i-ire.* Such a faulty pronunciation is not only tolerated in many choirs and musical schools, but it is sometimes inculcated by the precepts, as well as the example of the teacher. Why it should be so, is hard to conceive. To us it seems a perversion of taste, not less

evident than that which in other cases puts evil for good, and good for evil, bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.

Musical expression is to be considered in two points of view, — general, and particular. The first has immediate reference to the sentiment or thought to be expressed, the other to the verbal expression with which it is to be combined.

It has already been observed, that music is in its very nature so various, that it may be made to accommodate itself to a great variety of sentiments and occasions. For instance, it may either rouse to great energy, or lull into quietness and inaction. It may quicken the feelings either of joy or grief, and accommodate itself, both in nature and degree, to any moral effect we wish to produce. This consideration may seem to belong chiefly to the musical composer. It is important, however, for every vocal musician, and especially every chorister, to study the natural diversities of different tunes, in respect to the sentiments they are best suited to express, that he may readily adapt the best tune to any particular hymn that may be read. Without this he is liable to frustrate, instead of promoting the proper object of church music.

It is marvellous that so little attention is paid to this subject. Not only do choristers frequently apply tunes to sentiments which they never can be made to express, but the same is often done by compilers of musical books, and sometimes by musical composers.

For ourselves, we cannot help lamenting that the Minor Mode is almost excluded from late publications, and wholly disused in many choirs. If it be not the best suited to express penitential or pensive sentiments of any kind, it affords a variety, which is not to be given up without regret. It is true, there are tunes in the Major Mode, which, with an appropriate performance, may satisfy the tenderest feelings. Other tunes, though they may yield a little, are too unbending to be forced into sympathy with any kind of sorrow. If it be asked how these two kinds of music are to be distinguished, we answer, that the pensive class move chiefly in the *lower part* of the *tonic octave;* that is, between the key-note and the fifth above; such, for example, as Bath, Garland, Bethesda, or Pleyel's Hymn. On the other hand, if the air of the tune move chiefly in the upper

part of the tonic octave, or pass frequently from one key-note to another above or below, — that is, if it expatiate through a whole octave, — it is one of the cheerful or animated kind, which cannot be made to weep, though it may perhaps be restrained from exultation. Such, for example, are Truro, Rothwell, St. Ann's, Belmont, Silver Street, Germany or Worms, Telleman's Chant, and Haddam. Rightly applied, they are good tunes; but their value is diminished in proportion as they are forced out of their proper sphere. By a retarded movement, indeed, and certain modifications of voice, which we have not time to specify, they may be made to assume a degree of seriousness or solemnity which is not their natural characteristic, and this perhaps is the most that can be said of them.

While treating of general expression, it is important to observe, that in many hymns the sentiment is greatly varied from stanza to stanza, and sometimes from line to line. In such cases, a change of tune may sometimes be required, in order to bring out in a forcible manner the variation of sentiment. Where this is not convenient, there should be a corresponding change in the performance of the same tune, in the time, the quantity of voice, and other modifications, as the case may require. In many choirs, something of this kind is done; but generally, far less than the proper and full effect of music demands.

Particular expression in music has an immediate reference to the *verbal* expression, and must always harmonize with it. The force of language as applied to thought depends chiefly, we had almost said wholly, on emphasis. If the best sentence in the world were uttered in perfect monotony, with the same quantity of voice on every word, it would be little better than a body without a soul; and the like may be observed of music in the abstract, the life and spirit of which depend as much on alternations of louder and softer notes, as all excellence in the limner's art does on diversities of light and shade. The prominent notes embody the force of expression. If these remarks are just, is it not evident that all the benefit of combining music with poetry must depend on the coincidence of emphases in both? If these are at variance with each other, that is, if the emphatic notes in music fall on the unemphatic parts of the poetry, it is evident they will coun-

teract and destroy each other, and the effect will be no better than if two men, instead of cooperating in any design, were each to pull down what the other built up.

In order to become a proficient in that kind of expression we are now considering, it must, from the very nature of things, be indispensable in the vocal musician to acquaint himself with the laws of poetry and elocution; that is, if he be not already a good reader, he must become so, at least so far as emphasis and rhythm are concerned; for if, in any case, he knows not where to lay the verbal emphasis, how can he bring that of the music to coincide with it? It is not, however, sufficient to ensure this harmony, that he be a good reader. The nature and ground of musical emphasis require particular attention, and especially in him who is to adapt the tune to the words.

Emphasis in music depends on one or more of the following particulars.

First, the *place* which a note occupies in a tune, or succession of sounds. Music, as well as poetry, must have a rhythm, that is, there must be something like a regular alternation of louder and feebler sounds, sometimes in couplets, and sometimes in triplets. Without this alternation, there can be no music worthy of the name; for though the relative force of the notes may be occasionally reversed, they must not be changed so frequently as to break up a general order of succession. On this ground it is natural for singers to lay an emphasis in those places, which according to the order of succession are emphatic; and it sometimes requires effort, as well as attention to avoid it.

Secondly, the comparative *elevation* of a note makes it emphatic; especially when it occupies the place of a regular emphasis. In elocution the emphatic tones are, with very few exceptions, higher than the unemphatic ones, and it is this prominence, which gives them their principal force. The fact is the same in music. If the second note in the air of Haddam, for instance, should fall on an unemphatic syllable, it would be next to impossible to avoid giving that syllable an absurd, if not a ridiculous importance. The like may be said of the second note in the third line of the air in Dundee, and the corresponding note in St. Paul's.

Thirdly, the *length* of a note, or the comparative time it occupies, has an important influence on the emphasis. Public speakers often dwell on those words, to which they would call particular attention, or, what amounts to nearly the same thing, make a pause after them, though the following words be closely connected. That the same practice should give emphasis in music, is what we might expect, and the force is augmented if, instead of a single note, a syllable be made to cover two or more notes, amounting to the same length, and especially if they fall from a higher to a lower one, which is almost always the case in rhetorical emphasis.

In the last place, emphasis may be increased or diminished by increasing or diminishing the *quantity* of voice. This, however, appears to us less effectual than some things mentioned above.

All the constituents of emphasis here enumerated are frequently combined in giving force to a particular point in music, and they render it perfect. One or two of the three first, however, with the aid of the fourth may suffice. With a proper degree of attention to these principles, the chorister may always adapt the tune to the hymn, as far as the irregularity of most hymns will permit. Such, however, are the changes that are often made in the rhythm in passing from one stanza to another, that many of the emphases in the music must clash with the poetical expressions, and entirely subvert them. If a tune be well adapted to the first stanza, it may, for that very reason, be ill suited to every other, so that no effort can prevent absurd expressions. Thus superlative importance is frequently given to an *and*, a *to*, or a *the*, while the principal word — the name of *God*, it may be — is sunk into comparative insignificance. Were we not accustomed to these perversions, we should not endure them for a moment. We should regard them as perfectly shocking.

In the year 1823, a book, containing about an hundred and fifty hymns, was offered to the public, designed to exemplify a method by which these difficulties might be removed. The hymns, which were all original, were intended to be so perfectly regular, that a tune which was well adapted to one stanza, would, so far as emphasis or rythm was concerned, be equally suited to every other

stanza. In 1830, a *Collection* of hymns on the same general plan was published. Some circumstances, connected with the time in which it appeared, probably operated against so favorable a reception as it might otherwise have secured. There were, besides, some inherent difficulties to prevent full success. The plan required many alterations in the hymns selected, though, perhaps, not more than had been tolerated in the New York and the Cambridge Collections, as well as in several English publications; where they were often made for the mere gratification of taste. We have nothing to object to the strong attachment to old hymns, which has lately been revived, having ourselves so much of the same feeling that we should not without reluctance either lay aside, or alter the best productions of Watts, Doddridge, and some more recent authors. Still, they are not capable of being well expressed by the repetition of psalm tunes; and it appears to us, that in general they ought not to be sung in any other way than that of chanting. For this kind of music, irregularities increase the value of a hymn; that is, if the chant be so arranged as to give the proportional length and emphasis to the successive words and syllables. That hymn of Cowper, for instance,

"God moves in a mysterious way,"

can be nothing more than mangled in any psalm tune, that ever was or can be made; whereas it may be chanted to perfection. All that is wanted to effect this is, to have some notation, that will express the proportional length of the notes; and this may be done by the application of the figures 1, 2, 4, and 8, representing the semibreve, the minim, the crotchet, and the quaver, together with the points used in music.

The Collection of hymns mentioned above was introduced into several societies; but the general taste, we fear, is unfavorable to the success of this, or any other attempt to make our church music what it should be — an aid to devotion. There is too little seriousness in many of those who compose our choirs, if not in the leaders themselves. It is too often the principal object to exhibit their own powers and musical attainments; and where it is not so, there is generally such a thirst for change, as can hardly be reconciled with essential improvements in musical performance. In

most choirs, the time is chiefly consumed in acquiring a superficial acquaintance with new tunes, instead of learning to give more expression to old ones, which are often the best. Till this vitiated taste be corrected, there is little hope of improvement. How it is to be corrected we know not, unless it be by adopting the method of some few churches, — that of making the musical exercise the service of the congregation generally, and not of an exclusive choir. The propriety and the benefits of such a change, and the best means of obviating the disadvantages that would attend it, cannot now be discussed.

As every theory is better understood and appreciated when illustrated by examples, we subjoin the following hymn, in which, as it may be observed, there is a correspondence between the emphases of one stanza, and those of every other.

THE DESPONDING CONSOLED.

Tune, "Peace, Troubled Soul."

Cheered by the rays of hope divine,
Thou child of grief, no longer pine.
Why shouldst thou doubt thy Father's care,
Who ne'er denied a filial prayer?
Whose hand is ever prompt to save,
And grant thee all thy heart should crave.

Does ill desert thy hope destroy?
Or earth-born fears o'ercloud thy joy?
Strive to subdue the power of sin,
And all foreboding cares within;
Then soar aloft on wings of faith,
Above the fear of change, or death.

Earth may be dark to downcast eyes,
But mercy beams through all the skies;
God is our light, who yet will shine,
Through every cloud, with ray benign:
No longer then, like one forlorn,
In life-corroding sorrow mourn.

Brief are the woes of hearts renewed,
To Heaven's decree resigned, subdued;
Soon mayst thou lay thy burdens down,
In worlds of light receive thy crown;
And there, relieved of all thy fears,
Enjoy the fruit now sown in tears.

S. W.

ART. VIII.—RELATION BETWEEN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.*

WE are well aware of the vast difference between our own age, and that in which Patrick, Lowth and Whitby flourished and wrote. They knew little of our present conflicts of opinion as to matters of philosophy and points of criticism. They lived towards the close of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. They had done their work before Tindal and Shaftesbury had become the public champions of Deism in England, and of course before Germany followed in their career and neology arose in the speculations of Bahrdt and the criticisms of Michaelis. They write apparently undisturbed by the questions that now most trouble the earnest student of the sacred volume. No more fearful foes than Le Clerc and Socinus appear to haunt their vision. There is something very refreshing in observing the quiet confidence in which their faith rests upon the letter of the sacred page. Whitby may have less of this quietude than the two others, and was undoubtedly a man of a more modern cast than they. But in his pages we do not find that those matters are handled which have most troubled the scholars of our own day. Nothing would probably have surprised these men more than one of our modern Commentaries of the Orthodox stamp, for example, that of Tholuck or Olshausen, or even our own Stuart, with all its references to a kind of philosophy and criticism as then unheard of,

---

* *A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha.* By PATRICK, LOWTH, ARNALD, WHITBY and LOWMAN. A New Edition, with the Text printed at large. In Four Volumes. Imp. 8vo. Philadelphia, and New York. 1844–5.

or if heard of, not strongly enough asserted to demand any open refutation. Yet these men lived at a time of peculiar interest, and had gone through a peculiar discipline. They flourished after the Church of England had passed through its two great trials, first with its Romanist, and then with its Puritan foes, and was seeking to find rest in some golden mean between Popish formalism and Calvinistic fanaticism. Their Commentaries partake much of the character of their position. They are moderate, candid, sensible, free from objectionable extremes. They give a very good idea of the mild Orthodoxy of the Church from which they emanated, before Whitefield had revived the spirit of the great Genevan, or Froude and Pusey had called up the ghost of Laud.

Patrick seems to us the least valuable of the three as to learning and power. Lowth, learned and judicious as he is, gains much when associated with his more genial and imaginative son, who followed him in his critical labors, and who bears to his father something of the relation of the fair foliage and fruit to the rough trunk of the parent tree. Perhaps, on the whole, no Orthodox commentator on the New Testament is worth more than Whitby, although our Trinitarian friends will not blame us for wishing that his work had been written after, instead of before he became a Unitarian of the Arian order. As to the works of Arnald on the Apocrypha and Lowman on the Apocalypse, we cannot hope to derive much light from them in the present advanced state of learning. It is too late in the day to take it for granted, as the Dissenter Lowman does, that all Christian history is wrapped up in the mystical Apocalypse; and such is the present knowledge of the Alexandrian mind, in which the chief thought of the Apocryphal Books arose, that we must look to a deeper scholar and thinker than the Churchman Arnald, to describe that singular combination of Oriental mysticism, Jewish faith, and Greek philosophy, in which Trinitarian Orthodoxy was developed gradually by the son of Sirach, by Philo, and finally by Athanasius.

The publication of a series of commentaries upon the whole Bible may be allowed to furnish us with an occasion for some remarks upon the relation which exists between the Old and New Testaments.

The value of the Old Testament for us who live under

the better light of the New, is a topic upon which Christians have differed for ages past, and must probably be content to differ for ages to come. Yet it should and will be discussed, for many important doctrinal and practical questions depend upon its treatment, whilst it is evident that light is constantly breaking in upon passages formerly dark, and history and literature cannot but be gainers by the study, although the results may somewhat disappoint the zeal of dogmatists in their passion for complete system. Strike out of being the treasures of knowledge that have been gathered by those scholars who have tried to illustrate Christianity by the critical, theological and philosophical study of the Old Testament, and we lose at once one of the richest departments of our libraries. An intelligent infidel would weep at the loss to literature, though indifferent or glad at the loss to Christian faith.

Yet Christian faith, or we should rather say, the faith of Christians, is very unsettled as to the significance and worth of the Old Testament. Even in the early ages of the Church, we find what may be considered as extreme views. The Gnostics, no small sect either in numbers or intelligence, made light of the Old Testament, and pronounced it to be the work not of the Supreme God, but of an inferior deity; and the Christians who passed as Catholic, with no taint of Gnostic heresy, explained the difficulties of the Jewish Scriptures sometimes by figurative interpretation, and sometimes by regarding the troublesome passages as cases in which the Almighty had stooped from his majesty, and accommodated his revelation to the infirmities of men, even as parents sometimes affect the tones of childhood, and prattle with the prattlers of the nursery.

But it is very evident, that as Christians grew in number and power and began to cherish ambitious designs, the Jewish spirit revived, and passion for earthly dominion justified itself by the ancient theocracy, and the Old Testament was appealed to as sound authority by the princes and prelates of the hierarchy that sought to rule the earth in the name of Heaven. Under Papacy the Law came back in its force, whilst the Gospel was veiled in rites and ceremonies; although from Augustine to Luther much of the Evangelical faith was cherished in secret, and trusted in the free grace and saving spirit of God in spite of the tre-

mendous formalism in which spiritual religion was generally imprisoned.

In the Reformation the power of the old dispensation fell considerably, and the peculiar element of the Gospel — the power of faith in distinction from works of the Law, was insisted upon so vehemently as sometimes to threaten evil, and to run into lawlessness in its horror of legalism. Yet Luther never forgot his early culture, nor was he such by nature as to be indifferent to that imposing ritual which bore so many traces of the ancient temple. He was with David and Solomon in his ecclesiastical tastes, and yet with Paul in his doctrinal theology. He would have liked to keep his allegiance to the Catholic Church, while he purified its doctrines and practices. Calvin here differed from him. Without Luther's poetical taste and hearty feeling, the stern Genevan turned his back upon the old Church, its ministry, rites and doctrines, and would have neither the temple in its ancient beauty nor the Law in its minute exactions. Whilst he received the Old Testament as Divine, he interpreted it typically, and regarded the Mosaic Law and ritual as having their fulfilment in the Gospel, and to be valued in their fulfilment, like a prophecy in its completion. The doctrine of Calvin seems now to be the predominant one in regard to the Old Testament among Orthodox Christians not of the Catholic school.

As to Liberal Christians, they in one respect lean more to Catholic, in another to Calvinistic views of the old dispensation. With the Catholics they value works of the moral law more than Calvinists do, whilst with the Calvinists they place far less value on ritual forms than the Catholics. At the same time they differ from both parties in ascribing an alloy of merely human thought and action to the composition of these ancient books, in which they recognise the record of a Divine revelation.

But we must not, of course, be content with glancing thus at the history of opinions regarding the Old Testament in its relation to the New. We must have an opinion of our own. We now ask where the truth really lies, or what is the actual connection between the two dispensations.

To decide this question we must define our terms. By the Old and New Testaments, we do not mean to designate the two collections of scriptures which bear those titles,

but the two systems of religion which these two collections of scriptures record. Our office is with things, not words — with theology, not philology; although we are not of those who are fond of scoffing at the letter.

Looking then to the things in question, we ask, what is that system of religion called the old dispensation, and what the new?

By the old dispensation we understand the Mosaic Law, by the new we understand the Gospel of Christ. If it be asked what we do with the patriarchal dispensation or the Abrahamic covenant, we reply, that this is comprehended in the Law and Gospel, and fulfilled in them to the posterity of Abraham, and therefore needs no separate consideration now.

Such being the two dispensations under consideration, what is the relation between them, or in other words, wherein do they agree, and wherein do they differ? In their general object they both agree, since they both aim to reconcile men with God by inducing men to obey the Divine will. In both God reveals his mind through mediating agents, and offers blessings on condition of obedience. Yet, when more closely viewed, important differences appear between the two, alike in the parties and the terms of the engagements.

In the Law, God reveals his mind through Moses to a single nation, and promises them prosperity under an earthly kingdom as the reward of obedience. In the Gospel, God through his Son Jesus Christ, with whom he in person dwells and by whom he grants his spirit, reveals himself to mankind, and offers them eternal life under a heavenly kingdom as the consequence of faith and of obedience. These are the obvious characteristics of the two systems, beyond all question. On the one side we have the Law and an earthly kingdom, on the other the Gospel and a heavenly kingdom. When it is maintained, as by Calvin, that the Old Testament proposed not merely prosperity, but immortality, and this not as the reward of merit, but as the gift of mercy through Jesus who was the veiled Mediator of the old Covenant, it is evident that a liberty is taken which the Jewish Scriptures by no means sanction, and which comes from adopting a peculiar theory of revelation

and applying it to the Mosaic system, by typical interpretation.

Taking the explicit principles of the two dispensations for the ground of our remark, let us now look more closely into their points of difference. All that can be justly said upon this topic may be comprehended in the declaration of our Saviour, that he came not to destroy the Law, but that the Law through him might be fulfilled. In his Gospel it is fulfilled, and the superior fulness of the Gospel is its main point of difference from the Law. God cannot contradict himself, and of course all dispensations of Divine Providence must agree, although one may be more complete than another, even as the dawn and the noonday are both from the same heavenly light, although by no means both equal in brightness. The superiority of the Gospel is manifest in three leading points, — the revelation regarding God, man, and the way of reconciliation or salvation.

In regard to the being and attributes of God, the New Testament maintains the leading doctrines of the Old, and at the same time throws a much brighter light upon the Divine nature. In the Old Testament one class of the attributes of the Supreme Being is most prominently brought forward, — his justice more than his mercy, his regal more than his parental character. The New Testament views him as the just Ruler and almighty Sovereign, but softens the severity of these attributes by new developments of his paternal love.

Again, the *mode* of his manifestation differs in the two cases. In the one case he gives a specific law through Moses, in the other reveals his wisdom, power and love through a being with whom he associated himself in so intimate a manner, that they who saw the Son saw the Father, and by faith in the Son had communion with the Father. In the one case the written letter speaks his commandments, in the other a divine life breathes his spirit. He spoke by Moses, he dwelt ever with Christ. Only in Jesus has the Divine word been fully manifested in the flesh, or brought within the apprehension of men.

In respect to man, the second party in the two Covenants, the Law differs much from the Gospel in point of fulness. The one is addressed particularly to a nation, the other to all mankind. The one illustrates chiefly the duties of man

as a member of an earthly kingdom, the other speaks chiefly of his relations as the citizen of a heavenly kingdom. The one treats of offences chiefly as crimes against the State, the other treats of them as sins against God and grounds of spiritual condemnation. We cannot say that there is no trace of the doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament; much less can we say with Warburton, that Moses sought to draw attention away from this doctrine as likely to distract the minds of the people from the national mission upon which they were sent. No nation has been found in which there are not some ideas of a future existence, and there are passages in the Pentateuch which seem based upon some popular notions of a life hereafter. Yet Moses nowhere in his Law explicitly states the doctrine, nor founds his appeal upon the retributions of the world to come. Undoubtedly the people connected with the Law some sense of the spiritual world, and the yearnings of the soul for higher assurance must have moved many a heart before the Prophets did so much to give this assurance by their sublime anticipations of Christianity. But in the Gospel the eternal life is explicitly revealed both by word and deed. Doctrine and miracle combine to take from death its sting and from the grave its victory. The resurrection from the dead is one of the essential doctrines of the Gospel, whilst it is not once mentioned in any part of the Mosaic code, whatever may be said of certain passages in the Old Testament in which future life is predicated of certain individuals.

As to the standard of character exhibited under the two dispensations, examples are more satisfactory than opinions. Moses is the pattern of legal obedience, Jesus is the model of gospel spirituality. The one serves God by definite rules, the other by vital principles; the one has the meekness of a mind obedient to law, the other the meekness of a soul pervaded by the Divine spirit; the one saw God in his terrors, the other rested in the Father's bosom in the perfect love that "casteth out fear;" the one was busied with preventing evil, the other thought more of creating good; the one insisted more on the pains of transgression, the other urged more the joys of obedience; the one deals more in the penalties of sin, the other begins his principal discourse with the beatitudes of holiness, and ends his life

with words of forgiveness to his murderers; one was the impersonation of the spirit of national honor, the other of Divine humanity; one was leader of a rebellious people, the other the Saviour of an apostate race. Compare the principal scenes in the lives of the two — Sinai with Tabor, Pisgah with Calvary, — and their characters shed new light on the words, "the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

But we must stop this parallel, and turn to the last point of comparison, — the grounds of acceptance with God, or the way of salvation. This is the topic upon which controversy has been most bitter and copious. Upon this point too the New Testament is very full and explicit. Besides many incidental references to the subject, we have three considerable treatises upon the relation of the Gospel to the Law in its bearing on human duty and acceptance with God. The Sermon on the Mount institutes an express comparison between the prevalent legal morality and true Christian principles, although the comparison is between the Gospel and predominant Jewish notions rather than actual Mosaic principles. The Epistle to the Romans gives a full exposition of the superiority of the Gospel, with its justifying faith, over the Law, with its righteousness of works; although even here we apprehend Paul rather has in mind Pharasaic perversions of the Law than any just deductions from the ancient code, whilst it is evident that he does claim for the Gospel great superiority over the Law as to spirituality and power. The Epistle to the Hebrews contains a minute illustration of the bearing of the Jewish ritual upon the new dispensation, and shows how fully the Gospel carries out all the purposes of the temple, its priests and sacrifices, and does them all away by establishing the great reality of which they were but the sign.

Let us now sum up briefly the teachings of these three New Testament authorities. We regard the Sermon on the Mount both as refuting Pharasaic additions to the Law, and what is more important, referring to great spiritual principles the duties which the Law treated under minute rules, which cramped the soul into formalism, and tended to substitute dead legalism for filial obedience. There is not a single point in the decalogue, which this divine sermon does not illustrate and refer to its master-principle.

One who has not looked upon the subject thus, will be surprised at the regularity and fulness of our Lord's commentary upon both the tables of commandments, the religious and the moral.

To discuss at any length the doctrine of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, would be out of place and time here. It must suffice to state results of study of the Epistle, rather than array arguments for our conclusion. We regard the contrast instituted by Paul between the Law and Gospel as turning upon one point. No law, whether civil, ceremonial, or moral, no code of specific rules, is able to give the soul peace with God. The moral law indeed may tell us what to do, but cannot give us power to do it, and even if it could enable us to comply with its directions, might not set the soul at rest concerning those great and heavenly realities, which man craves to know. The statement of a law of duty proves to us how far below its standard our actual character is, and thus brings the knowledge of sin. But the Gospel relieves the great difficulty. In Christ God in all his love is presented to us as the object of our filial faith, and whenever we trust in him with a sincere and penitent heart, we stand accepted before him, and have new peace and hope and power. We are placed on Gospel ground, and have "the law of the spirit of life" that is able to free the soul from "the law of sin and death." Or, to use the oft repeated words, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." And this faith, instead of leading to laxity or neglect of works, gives greater ardor for obedience, "that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit."

As the Sermon on the Mount takes a practical view of the two Covenants, and the Epistle to the Romans a doctrinal view, so the Epistle to the Hebrews concerns itself with the ritual view, and treats of the Jewish temple in its bearing on the Christian system. Addressed to the Jewish Christians in Palestine whilst the temple was yet standing in all its hallowed majesty and attractive beauty, this letter tries to convince them of the superiority of Christ over the ministers of the ancient Covenant, and thus win them away from their exclusive creeds and forms. The writer makes out his point by proving the superiority of Jesus to the an-

gels by whom primitive revelations were made, also to Moses by whom the Law came, and to Aaron, the chief of the Jewish priesthood. He regards the Law as having "a shadow of good things to come," and the holy of holies into which the high priest yearly entered with the sacrifice, as an emblem of the Saviour who with the sacrifice of his own life "passed within the veil by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us;" and he bids us "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." The peculiar prerogative of the Christian thenceforth is to look not to a visible priest and a visible temple, but to one in the heavenly world, "the author and finisher of our faith;" and this faith brings new peace and power as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

Thus following the guidance of three important passages of the New Testament, we learn of Jesus, to rise above the letter of the Law to the holy love upon which all depends; we learn of Paul, to seek acceptance, not by works of legal obedience, but by a filial faith that puts the soul on Gospel ground and gives the spirit of life; we learn of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to trust to a high priest, not of earthly imperfections and ceremonial office, but of heavenly nature and in the presence of the Father presenting himself to us as our Mediator, reconciling us to God and sending forth divine influences into our souls. These views are perfectly accordant, and mutually illustrate one another. Jesus exhibits the spirit of the new Covenant, whilst the two Epistles state the means of winning this spirit by the power of faith and the efficacy of a risen Saviour. Other parts of the New Testament might be quoted, but enough has been adduced to illustrate the principal points of comparison between the two dispensations as to the doctrine of acceptance with God, or salvation.

Summing up all we have said of the fulness of the Gospel as compared with the Law in its revelations of God, and man, and the way of salvation, we conclude that Divine Providence has varied its discipline to meet the progressive wants of mankind. The old dispensation was addressed to a rude state of our race, and consisted in great part of prohibitory rules, with sanctions relating to immediate penalties or rewards. God appears as King, man as the sub-

ject, and legal obedience is the ground of acceptance. Yet this system has its spiritual side, and was undoubtedly so regarded by the most exalted minds of the Jewish nation, until at last in the Prophets its inward meaning is developed, and the Gospel itself seems to be proclaimed in almost all its fulness by these subjects of the Law.

The Gospel then being so superior in fullness to the Law, the question arises, what use are we to make now of the latter, what shall we do with the old dispensation and the book that contains it. Shall we despise the old Covenant, because a better is given? Surely not; for the new rests upon the old, and it is no honor to the new building to despise its ancient foundation. Nor can we safely neglect the Scriptures that contain the latter, for we disparage Jesus when we disregard the writings which he so often quoted and to which he so frequently refers.

As to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we are to study them from a Christian point of view, and get the most good from them that we can. We are to submit every word and principle to the Christian test, and regard nothing as authoritative that will not bear this test. It may not always be easy to separate the Divine from the human elements, nor to distinguish the transient from the permanent in the Jewish Scriptures. Nor are we required to do this, either by our Christian fidelity or for our Christian peace. That we should be required to have a decided opinion upon every passage of a series of two score writings, extending over a period of about four thousand years as to the events recorded, and about a thousand years as to the times of composition, is more than can be asked of us either in reason or conscience. It is enough to know, that the Old Testament contains a Divine revelation, and that its constituent scriptures have been providentially collected. A stream of inspiration runs through the volume, and pours its waters into the Gospel, and there we may find them in their purity. But if we trace the course of the stream along its banks, we must expect to find many tokens of the earthy soils through which it has passed, and the dust of gold by no means unmingled with baser sands. Time would fail us to show the use to be made by the Christian of the various portions of the Old Testament. A few words may be allowed in regard to the practical bearing of the old dis-

pensation itself upon some of the leading questions and movements of our own time.

It is obvious that the leading tendencies in ethics and religion at present depend much upon the views held of the Old Testament. Where would Catholics, whether Roman, Greek, or Anglican, be, without their appeal to the Jewish temple and its three orders of ministers? Where would the Calvinistic school be, without the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, which surely no man could find in the Gospel without looking through some prevalent interpretations of the Law? The Calvinist differs from the Catholic by giving up the temple and founding his church on the model of the synagogue, yet even he exaggerates Judaism by his doctrine of vicarious punishment and imputed righteousness. From both we must differ, and regard the temple with its priests as passed away, and the sacrifices of the Law as fulfilled once for all in the love in which Jesus died and the truth and power which his mission imparts. Better however, for more reasons than one, if we are to *Judaize* the Gospel, to go with the Catholic than the Calvinist, and to have the Jewish temple and the Jewish sacrifice together than to retain the one and reject the other. Yet such is not our alternative. The New Jerusalem has no priests but brethren, no sacrifices but those of love. We best follow the meaning of the old and the plain teachings of the new dispensation, in quitting the servitude of the Law and laying hold of the freedom of the Gospel in the peace of its faith and the order of its charity.

It is evident that many moral as well as theological questions depend upon the significance to be given to the Old Testament. Take, for example, the questions of the punishment of crime, the rights of nationality, and the allowableness of war, — it is evident that opinions vary very much according to the estimation of certain statements in the Jewish Scriptures.

The advocates of capital punishment have little Scriptural authority out of the Mosaic code. That code is not binding on Christians, except so far as sanctioned by the fundamental principles of Christian morals — the love of God and of man. To prove that these principles demand the infliction of punishment by death, is a matter upon which moralists have yet to satisfy the minds of men.

The common doctrine of national exclusiveness, too, is more Jewish than Christian, more disposed to regard the nation as the chosen people, than to protect its interests on the ground of a generous love that would befriend all men, and therefore befriends those most whom national ties have brought nearest. True nationality is but one form of good neighborhood. The nations of Christendom have yet to show that they are of the Christian, not of the Jewish school. The nation, proudest of the Christian name, has often exercised the prerogative of the people divinely elected, and with Jewish exclusiveness, without its divine sanctions, has invaded foreign climes, as if every Canaan were its rightful land of promise.

Hence the frequent justification of war against the infidel. Spain, England, nay even our own Puritan fathers have warred against savages as by divine right. Even now there are those who defend the recent attack of England upon China, on the ground of opening a way for the Gospel of Christ into the heart of that vast nation. One of the ablest writers of our day, Maurice, in his "Kingdom of Christ," seems to claim for every nation the rights of the Jewish theocracy, and to connect the State in its warlike character with the Church and its divine sanctions. A picture of the Bishop of Winchester consecrating the banners of a regiment that was recently victorious in India, would make no poor representation of some scene in Jewish history, — some priest or prophet imprecating curses upon national enemies or imploring blessings upon the Jewish arms. Croly, in his interpretation of the Apocalypse, regards England as the modern Israel, and holds up Pitt, Nelson and Wellington as it were the second Moses, Joshua and Gideon. Undoubtedly there is much power in the belief that a nation has an exclusive mission, and its statesmen and soldiers are not only promoting their own success, but the glory of God. But we need not go back to Moses for the true source of the nation's power and the true fidelity of the citizen. Christianity has principles of its own to apply to every interest of life, to the race and nation as well as to the individual.

When we assert the superiority of the Gospel over the Law, we by no means favor that social radicalism and vague spiritualism that war with all established institutions,

breaking down family subordination, national government, and church order. The Gospel exalts these institutions, instead of overthrowing them. The love of God and the love of man, prompted by faith in Jesus, tend to create a nobler civilization, in which the energy of ancient systems is retained, blended with the mild genius of Christianity. A truly Christian state of society comprises within itself the great elements of the earlier dispensations, and develops them in their fullness. Thus the progressive ages of social order are like the progressive stages of the material creation. As each being in the scale of creation, whether mineral, vegetable or animal, contains the elements of each inferior creature, and man rises above all and unites within himself the excellence of all lower beings, and with reason added is a world in miniature, so each successive revelation carries with it the great principles of its predecessors. The first dispensation was to the family of Abraham, the second to a nation made up of families, the third to a race made up of nations, and Christianity at once exalts the family and the nation, the home and the State, whilst at the same time it builds up a broad communion of believers, a spiritual church, whose love is bounded by no lines of merely domestic or national limitation. Let us then, as we honor family union and civil order, honor the ancient dispensations which have done so much to consecrate them, and while we accept the free, broad Gospel of Christ, let us not forget what God ordained of old through Abraham and Moses.

In closing what we have to say of the relation of the Old and New Testaments, let us not sink the fervor of Christian faith in the discussions of critical study. In devotional hours let the Law and Prophets rise before us in connection with the Gospel, as their great representatives did on the Mount of transfiguration. There appeared unto the apostles Moses and Elias talking with Jesus. Let the Law in its stern justice and prophecy with its sublime yearnings stand before us in company with our Saviour, and bear testimony to him as the fulfilment of the righteousness of the Law and the aspirations of the Prophets.

S. O.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Vital Christianity: Essays and Discourses on the Religions of Man and the Religion of God. By ALEXANDER VINET, D. D., Professor of Theology in Lausanne, Switzerland. Translated, with an Introduction, by ROBERT TURNBULL, Pastor of the Harvard Street Church, Boston. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1845. 12mo. pp. 355.

We confess that we are somewhat at a loss to explain the very high praise bestowed on this volume of Discourses or Essays, by some whose opinions should not be lightly pronounced. We are aware of the facility with which commendatory letters, or notes, extracts from which are intended to forestall public opinion, and procure a favorable reception to the volume they precede or accompany, are obtained by publishers, editors, and translators. Still the very little critical discrimination which often marks these epistolary advertisements, coming frequently from men well known in the walks of literature or theology, is something we cannot fully comprehend. Undoubtedly the religious character of the discourses before us, added to a certain smoothness, polish and vivacity of style, will cause them to be cheerfully welcomed by a portion of the religious public. This we can readily conceive, and have no fault to find with it. It is true, we do not regard the discourses as very stirring performances; they are not remarkable for depth, and though evidently the production of a fresh and ardent, and we may add, vigorous mind, they are marked by no original expositions of Christian doctrine, and open, as it seems to us, no new and striking trains of thought. Yet they are lively and animated productions, and those who have no objection to their theology may read them, we doubt not, with pleasure and profit. The best of them, we think, are those which are most strictly practical.

So far, and so far only, can we go along with the admirers of these discourses, among whom we cannot but express our surprise to find some whose theology, if not their taste, we should have supposed, would have revolted at no inconsiderable portions of them. We do not discover in them anything of the philosophical acuteness which is claimed for them, nor anything which entitles them to the praise of containing a refutation of what is called the infidelity or skepticism of the age. We do not think that this skepticism is to be overcome and its fortresses to be thrown down by such weapons. The objections the author combats, it is to be observed, are levelled chiefly against

the Trinitarian and Calvinistic doctrines, and we do not therefore feel bound to reply to them except by saying, that Christianity, as we understand it, does not teach these doctrines. L.

Letters from New York. Second Series. By L. Maria Child, Author of Philothea, etc. New York and Boston. 1845. 12mo. pp. 287.

The habit of looking on the common sights, occurrences, duties and relations of daily life with an eye to their moral aspect and spiritual significance is so rare, that we ought to welcome any attempts like these of Mrs. Child, not only for their own intrinsic merit, but for the example they afford and for the good sign they hold out. And yet we are not among those who think the indefinite multiplication of this sort of writings would be an unqualified benefit, or a wholly desirable acquisition to our literature. This volume announces itself as a continuation of the similar collection of letters published some months ago, and is in the same happy, striking, philanthropic vein. Mrs. Child's sympathies are always on the side of humanity and virtue, faith and hope. She pleads eloquently for the humble, the poor, the unfortunate; she hates war, slavery, and the pride of wealth. And not seldom her noble sentiments stir the whole heart. We are sorry to observe occasionally the least leaning towards something that bears the bad semblance of "Come-out-ism,"—a disposition to indulge in flings at venerable objects associated in many men's thoughts with the ordinances and institutions of the Gospel. No person, we insist, ought even to enter on that path, except it be one whose mind or heart has never derived impulses of strength, directly or indirectly, from these very Christian ordinances and institutions. Others must expect to be charged with ingratitude as well as impiety for such rude attacks; and Mrs. Child, whose heart is so full of the *spirit* of Christ's religion, would feel deeply wounded, we are sure, if she were accused of either. She is a Swedenborgian, but her soul is too large to wear the gear of any sect. Here and there we find in her pages a conceit that is doubtful in point of taste, —such as calling Grecian statues "petrified melodies." There is rather too frequent use of one of the personal pronouns, and an exceedingly frank disclosure of personal wishes, impulses, habits and notions, which would be quite suitable for a private diary or a familiar epistle to a friend, but which in a published work suggest the reflection, that they might be omitted without seriously impairing the value of the book. To say, for example, in bald terms, "If I were as rich as John Jacob Astor, I would do thus and thus," is not well; it places the reader at liberty, if

indeed it does not invite him, to ungallantly dispute the assertion by an unpleasant reference to the maxim about the transforming effect of circumstances on cases. And then it is a sort of public rebuke of Astor, which Astor has a right to reckon a grievance. To say, as in the Letter on Valentines, "My mind has a troublesome habit which compels it to fly high above the surface of things, or dive into the hidden caves beneath," is an expression of gross vanity ill-concealed by a piece of wretched affectation. But Mrs. Child is undoubtedly a woman of remarkable character and the finest qualities, — not only of uncommon genius and insight, but of pre-eminent kindness, heartiness, application and industry. Her moral courage is in nothing more completely demonstrated than in the fact, that she is willing to entrust to a common-sense world passages that are so near the verge of propriety and good taste as those relating to Ole Bull and his violin. We should not be surprised if some readers, knowing her through her books alone, should have formed a conception of her as a home-forsaking person, with a weather-beaten bonnet, double-soled shoes, a green umbrella and a huge portfolio, plunging and prying about all the corners of New York city for materials to correspond about. She is no such being; but a true, genuine woman. The passion for a wider sphere, as they call it, does not unsex her, nor render her neglectful of domestic duty. It is a great comfort to speak of the productions of an individual who can be told of her few faults, is open to conviction, and loves plainness of speech. H.

A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for the Sanctuary. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. pp. xxvii, 558. 18mo.

Christian Hymns for Public and Private Worship. A Collection compiled by a COMMITTEE of the CHESHIRE PASTORAL ASSOCIATION. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. xxxii, 454.

We announced the preparation of these new Collections of Hymns for the use of our churches in a previous number, and we hope hereafter to devote an article to a consideration of their merits. We have now room only to say, that from a cursory examination we believe them both to be excellent compilations, and worthy of the attention not only of congregations recently formed, but of many societies in which older books are now in use. The first named, prepared by Rev. Mr. Ellis of Charlestown, contains, besides the hymns — 658 in number — selections from the Psalms, arranged for chanting or responsive reading. The other volume, though of smaller size, contains 908 hymns, and is printed in a very neat type.

A Scripture Catechism; containing the Principles of the Christian Religion, stated in the Words of the Bible. For the use of Sunday Schools. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 12mo. pp. 56.

This, we conceive, is just what the times demand. It supplies a want which has been for some time sensibly felt, — that is, of a little manual for the use of Sunday schools, which should serve not only to awaken the religious affections of the young, but help them to obtain definite conceptions. of what the Scriptural doctrines, on some of the most important subjects, really are. The title of this manual indicates its character, and the following sentence from the excellent preface, gives further intimation of the leading views of the writer. "Revelation," observes the author, who, we suppose we are authorized to say, is Rev. Mr. Peabody of New Bedford, "proceeds on the idea — to whose importance the experience of our own day gives ample and melancholy testimony — that it is not enough to appeal to and awaken the religious sensibilities, but that men need *instruction in religious truth.*" Without saying anything in disparagement of other manuals, or instituting any comparison, we may be permitted to express the hope that this will soon be extensively introduced into our Sunday schools. The hints contained in the preface, concerning the mode of using it, however, should be carefully attended to. L.

Rejoinder to the "Reply" of the Hon. Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, to the "Remarks" of the Association of Boston Masters upon his Seventh Annual Report. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 8vo. pp. 64.

We hope that this pamphlet of the "Boston Masters" will close the controversy between them and the Secretary of the Board of Education, — a controversy begun with considerable ill-nature on their part, and continued by a reply from Mr. Mann, written under a degree of excitement which biased his judgment and exposed him to the charge of misrepresentation, a charge which he doubtless meant to avoid, but which even the most temperate controversialist can hardly escape without great care and forbearance. The "Reply" laid him open to retort, and the Masters have availed themselves of their opportunities. They have been careful to express their respect for his merits, but parts of the "Rejoinder," without being abusive, are severe, and much of it is able and convincing.

We particularly refer to the portion which treats of the modes of teaching children to read, and the article on school discipline. We can see no good likely to follow from a continuance of this dispute. There is no probability that more light will be thrown on the original subjects of controversy, and both sides must be losers by prolonging a mere personal altercation. The public are much more likely to believe charges than to investigate their truth; and when two parties undertake to injure each other's reputation, they are likely to be both successful. W.

Allegories and Christian Lessons: For Children. By T. B. Fox. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 144.

Hebrew Tales. Selected and translated from the Writings of the Ancient Hebrew Sages. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 12mo. pp. 100.

Ella Herbert; or, Self-Denial. By a LADY. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 71.

Moral Tales, for Young People. By Mrs. E. SEDGEWICK. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 3 vols. 18mo. pp. 220, 216, 246.

Five Years of Youth; of Sense and Sentiment. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. With a Preface by Mrs. E. L. Follen. Second American edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 255.

THESE works, though somewhat differing in character, form, we think, very suitable books for juvenile reading and Sunday school libraries. — The "Allegories" and "Lessons" by Mr. Fox, though most of them have been already printed for private distribution, have never, we believe, been published, and they are worthy of publication in this collected form. — The "Hebrew Tales," selected from a compilation by Hurwitz, may be safely put into the hands of the young, but will not have less interest for older readers, who may derive both pleasure and profit from the perusal. — "Ella Herbert" is written in a tone of pure Christian morality and feeling, and is fitted, we should think, to interest children. — The "Moral Tales" by Mrs. Sedgewick, consisting of "Lessons without Books," "Louisa and her Cousins," "the Beatitudes," and "Pleasant Sundays," published separately a few years ago, will, we hope, obtain in this uniform reprint the increased circulation which they deserve. — Miss Martineau's "Five Years of Youth" now appears in this country with a prefatory notice from Mrs. Follen, whose commendation, though strongly expressed, is, we think, justly bestowed. L.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — Since the publication of our last number, the unhappy difference which had existed for some time between Rev. Mr. Pierpont and the Proprietors of the Hollis Street meetinghouse in this city, has been brought to a close by Mr. Pierpont's resignation of his office as minister of the congregation. Four years ago an Ecclesiastical Council, after some days spent in examining certain "grounds of complaint" preferred against Mr. Pierpont, "resolved" that they did not furnish sufficient occasion for advising a dissolution of the connexion between him and his parish. The Proprietors subsequently voted not to accept the result of the Council. Mr. Pierpont then instituted proceedings at law for the recovery of his salary, which the Proprietors had for some time declined paying. The decision of the Court was given a short time since in his favor. Some farther correspondence having ensued between the parties, Mr. Pierpont made a voluntary and unconditional resignation of the ministry which he had held for twenty-six years. The Proprietors, we learn, have since voted to repair the meetinghouse and remodel the interior. — Rev. Mr. Blodgett of Deerfield has been compelled by the state of his health to leave his pulpit and relinquish the labors of the ministry. — Rev. Mr. Whitman has dissolved his connexion with the Second Unitarian society in Portland, Me., at the close of the period for which the connexion was formed. — Rev. Mr. Angier has obtained the reluctant consent of his people to the resignation of his ministry at Milton. — Rev. Mr. Dall has found his health so much affected by his labors in the ministry-at-large, that he will leave Baltimore, Md., as soon as any one shall appear to take his place. — We should have said in our last number, that Rev. Mr. Lord, (not Mr. Cushing,) had left Chicago and gone to Milwaukie.

The congregation at Montreal, Canada, have completed their house of worship, which is a very neat building of stone, occupying one of the best situations in the city, and is in respect to the plan, the work, and the furniture, worthy of being taken as a model. The whole expense of erecting and furnishing the house, including the organ, was about $9,000; of which more than $4,000 were subscribed in Montreal, and nearly the same amount was obtained by Mr. Cordner in the United States. The cost of the land, in addition, was $3,000, which will fall due several years hence, and for the payment of which a sinking fund has already been commenced. — The corner-stone of the Unitarian church at Hartford, Conn., was laid May 24, 1845, when an Address was delivered by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York. — A second Unitarian society has been organized at South Boston, where Rev. Mr. Thomas has conducted a service for several Sundays in a hall in the more thickly settled part of this suburb of our city. — A suitable piece of ground has been purchased for the erection of a second Unitarian meetinghouse at Roxbury. — The first steps have been taken in gathering another congregation in the northern part of Dorchester. — Likewise in Rochester, Mass.

The Anniversaries. — The meetings of the various religious and philanthropic associations which hold their anniversaries in this city at the close of May, were more fully attended this year than perhaps ever before. The facilities of travel have so greatly reduced both the expense and time necessary for a visit to Boston, that we may now expect a larger attendance than in former years, but we observed indications also of a greater interest in the purposes for which these meetings are held. The weather was favorable, and a general feeling of satisfaction seemed to prevail — at least in our own body. Our limits compel us to be brief in our notice even of the Unitarian meetings, while we can but allude to the many others which occurred at the same time. The number of the anniversary occasions which fall within this week is becoming a serious inconvenience — at least to those who would give any account of what is said and done. When two or three meetings are held at the same hour, selection is all that is permitted to human powers, and where almost every hour of the day has its appointed engagement, body and mind, the powers alike of attention and sensibility, feel the severity of the demand which is made upon them. Much as "anniversary week" may be welcomed, every one probably is glad when its exercises are finished.

American Unitarian Association. — The twentieth anniversary of this Association fell on Tuesday, May 27, 1845. The Committee, instead of attempting to crowd the business of the annual meeting into the hour or half-hour before the public services in the evening, from which inconvenience had been experienced in former years, appointed 9 o'clock in the morning as the hour of meeting, in the Berry Street vestry. Hon. Joseph Story, the President, being absent, and all the Vice Presidents, Hon. Stephen Fairbanks was chosen Chairman. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Farley of Brooklyn, N. Y. A resolution offered the last year by Mr. Farley, that the Constitution should be so amended as to increase the number of the Executive Committee, and provide for the appointment of laymen on the Board, was made the subject of discussion. The Association, finding the room in which they had assembled too small, adjourned to the Federal Street meetinghouse, where the discussion was resumed. Amendments to Mr. Farley's proposition were presented and considered, and after a free debate his motion, so far amended as to substitute in the fifth article of the Constitution, for the words "three Directors," the words — *six Directors, two of whom at least shall be laymen*, was adopted by a unanimous vote.

Rev. Mr. Lothrop offered a resolution empowering the Executive Committee to appoint a Travelling Agent, with a suitable salary; which was adopted. Mr. Geo. G. Channing offered a resolution authorizing the Executive Committee to apply for an Act of incorporation, if they should think it expedient; which was adopted. The Association then adjourned—at 1-2 past 12 o'clock—till the evening.

At the adjourned meeting, the Officers of the Association for the present year were elected by ballot, viz.: Rev. ORVILLE DEWEY, D. D. of New York, President, Judge Story having declined a reelection; Rev. Charles Briggs, General Secretary; Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, Assistant Secretary; Mr. Henry P. Fairbanks, Treasurer; Rev. Artemas B. Muzzey, Rev. George E. Ellis, Rev. Nathaniel Hall, Rev.

James F. Clarke, Henry B. Rogers Esq., Mr. Isaiah Bangs, Directors. The Vice Presidents of the last year were reelected by hand-vote, with the exception of James Taylor Esq., deceased, in whose place James H. Wells Esq. of Hartford, Conn., was chosen. The Treasurer read his Annual Report, which was accepted. The receipts of the year, including the balance on hand at the commencement, had been $11,255,54; the expenditures $9,149,90, and farther appropriations had been made to the amount of $4,624,59. An amendment of the Constitution, offered the last year by Mr. N. A. Barrett, was so amended as to provide that two of the Directors shall retire annually, and was then adopted.

The Association then adjourned from the vestry to the meeting-house, which was crowded. Rev. Dr. Dewey presided. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Livermore of Keene, N. H. The Annual Report of the Executive Committee was read by Mr. Briggs. It presented a favorable view of the efficiency of the Association during the last year, and noticed the principal grounds of encouragement in the present state of our denomination. Mr. Lothrop presented a series of resolutions, from the Executive Committee, for discussion, — having reference to the publication and distribution of tracts, the importance of theological education, and the extension of missionary efforts. Remarks were made by Rev. Messrs. Farley of Brooklyn, N. Y., Holland of Rochester, N. Y., Bellows of New York city, Harrington of Boston, Whitman of Portland, Me., Bulfinch of Boston, Fuller from Belvidere, Ill., Jones, late of Manchester, N. H., and the President. After which the Report was accepted, the usual Doxology was sung, and the meeting was dissolved at 10 o'clock. It was a good and pleasant meeting, yet we felt that if greater variety of topics and more spirituality of sentiment had marked the addresses, it would have been better. The speakers generally dwelt upon the visible relations and outward prosperity of Unitarianism.

The Collation. — This festive occasion seems now to be established among the anniversaries to which anticipation looks forward, and memory recurs, with most delight. By the excellent arrangements of the Committee even a larger number were seated at the tables than on the last year. After exchanging kind words and greetings in the upper hall, the company proceeded to the floor over the depot of the Worcester railroad, which affords the largest apartment for such a purpose in Boston, with the single exception of Faneuil Hall. At half past 2 o'clock, (on Tuesday, May 27,) 932 persons, of whom at least one half were ladies, were comfortably arranged along six tables extending through the length of the room. Hon. John Quincy Adams presided. The Divine goodness was acknowledged and a blessing asked by Rev. Mr. Lunt of Quincy, and at the close of the repast thanks were returned by Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston. An original hymn was then sung by the whole company. Mr. Adams then occupied a few minutes in an appropriate address, and invited others to follow him. After another hymn written for the occasion had been sung with great effect, remarks were made by Rev. Dr. Pierce of Brookline, Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield, and Samuel Greele Esq. of Boston; after which another original hymn was sung; which was followed by remarks from Rev. Mr. Gannett of

Boston, Hon. Francis Hincks of Montreal, Canada, Rev. Mr. Osgood of Providence, R. I., Rev. Mr. Gage of Petersham, Rev. Mr. Eliot of St. Louis, Mo., Rev. Dr. Dewey of New York, Rev. Mr. Bradford of Bridgewater, Rev. Mr. Huntington of Hillsboro', Ill., and Rev. Mr. Briggs of Plymouth. On motion of Hon. Mr. Fairbanks of Boston it was resolved by a unanimous vote to appoint a Committee to provide a similar entertainment the next year, and on motion of Mr. G. G. Channing of Boston such a Committee was appointed by the Chairman. Remarks were then offered, in compliance with calls made upon them, by Dr. Palfrey of Cambridge, Rev. Mr. Taylor of Boston, and Hon. Mr. Phillips of Salem; when it became necessary, in view of the meeting in the evening, to bring this celebration to an end, and the company retired at 1-4 before 7 o'clock.

Berry Street Ministerial Conference. — This meeting of our clergy was held the present year — on Wednesday morning, May 28 — in the chapel of the New Jerusalem Church in Phillips Place. Prayer having been offered by Rev. Mr. Whitman of Portland, Me., the annual Address was delivered by Rev. Dr. Dewey of New York, upon the "Rights, Claims, and Duties of Opinion;" which has been given in our previous pages. Rev. Dr. Thompson of Barre was chosen Moderator of the Conference, Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston Scribe, and Rev. Messrs. Young, Putnam, and Ellis, Standing Committee. Dr. Dewey brought under the notice of the brethren the general agreement in theological opinion between them and the members of the "Christian" denomination, and after reading a letter addressed to him by Elder Harvey, one of that Connexion, offered the following resolution, which, after remarks from several of the brethren, was unanimously adopted:—

"*Resolved*, in answer to a communication received by a member of this Conference from the Pennsylvania Christian Conference, through Elder J. J. Harvey, on the subject of Christian union, that the Conference receives with pleasure the hand of fellowship thus stretched out to the religious body which it represents, and expresses in return its friendly and hearty sympathy with the Pennsylvania Christian Conference, and with that Communion in general which denominates itself Christian."

The Standing Committee then reported five subjects from which the Conference might select one or more for discussion at this time. The Conference chose that which bore the nearest relation to the subject of the Address to which they had just been listening, and a very able and animated, but friendly discussion arose upon the manner in which "we should deal with the prevailing views which doubt or deny the supernatural element in Christianity;" at the close of which the Association adjourned till the afternoon, when the present position of Harvard College, under the charges which have been recently revived — being one of the subjects presented by the Committee — was made the occasion of remark, till the hour for the meeting of the Convention obliged the Conference to close its sessions.

Sunday School Society.—This Association celebrated its seventeenth anniversary in the Federal Street meetinghouse, on Wednesday eve-

ning, May 28. The President of the Society, Hon. S. C. Phillips, presided. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Palfrey of Barnstable. The Report was read by Rev. Mr. Waterston, and presented interesting views and statements in regard to Sunday School instruction, with extracts from communications addressed to the Corresponding Secretary. Hymns were sung at intervals during the evening by a choir of children from different Sunday schools, filling the front seats of the galleries; and addresses were made by Professor Brooks of Boston, Rev. Messrs. Gray of Boston, Fuller, late of Belvidere, Ill., Whitman of Portland, Me., Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H., Mr. W. R. Alger of the Cambridge Divinity School, Rev. Dr. Dewey of New York, and the President of the Society. The exercises were then closed, and the audience, which had entirely filled the house, retired at 10 o'clock. The meeting, though from its character our account of it may be brief, was one of the most pleasing and useful of the week.

Clerical Meeting on Slavery. — A call having appeared in our religious papers for a meeting of the clergy, in the course of the anniversary week, "to discuss their duties in relation to American Slavery," such a meeting was organized on Monday afternoon, May 26, in Ritchie Hall, by the choice of Rev. Dr. Thompson as Moderator, and Rev. Mr. Parkman of Dover, N. H., as Secretary. Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Willard. The nature of the call appeared not to have been understood, at least by all, as many were present who were not clergymen. After some attempts to correct this mistake, the discussion of the subject was commenced and pursued with spirit, till the necessary hour of adjournment. In the evening the discussion was resumed in the same place, Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro' in the chair, the audience still consisting in large part of others than ministers, and some laymen taking part in the discussion. The meeting was adjourned to the next evening and to the Berry Street vestry, where it obtained the character which it was meant it should bear from the first — of a clerical conference — though not numerously attended. Rev. Mr. Motte acted as chairman. At the close of the evening an adjournment took place to the next morning, when a considerable number of the brethren met, and the discussion was continued till the hour for the Convention Sermon. It was resumed at a subsequent session before dinner, and again in the afternoon. No difference of opinion was expressed in regard to the unchristian character or the sad effects of the institution of Slavery, but a wide difference respecting the duty or propriety of agitation and associated action on the subject. The discussion ended in the adoption of the following resolution by a vote of 44 to 7: —

"*Resolved*, That we consider Slavery to be utterly opposed to the principles and spirit of Christianity, and that as ministers of the Gospel we feel it our duty to protest against it in the name of Christ, and to do all we may to create a public opinion to secure the overthrow of the institution."

A Committee of twelve was then appointed "to draw up and circulate for signature among the ministers of the Unitarian body a Protest against the institution of American Slavery." The meeting was then dissolved.

Administration of the Lord's Supper. — This beautiful and affecting service, which this year for the third time made the conclusion of our anniversary celebrations, was observed in the Federal Street church on Thursday evening, May 29. A sermon — on the grandeur of the Christian life — from Revelations ii. 10, was preached by Rev. Dr. Dewey, who conducted the other services of the pulpit. After which the ordinance of the Supper was administered to the immense congregation who occupied the floor of the house, (while the galleries were filled with sympathizing spectators,) by Rev. Mr. Eliot of St. Louis. It was a sacred and delightful season, and when the closing hymn was sung by the great body of communicants who had just joined in the peculiar service of their faith, we seemed to be wrapt in an atmosphere of praise and love.

Prayer and Conference Meetings. — On Wednesday and Thursday mornings, May 28 and 29, meetings for conference and prayer were held in the commodious vestry of the Bulfinch Street meetinghouse, and were fully attended by ministers and laymen, and by persons of both sexes. The devotional services were fervent, the singing general, the addresses free, earnest and affectionate, and those who were present seemed to gain new strength for the religious life.

Other Anniversary Meetings. — The MASSACHUSETTS BIBLE SOCIETY observed its thirty-sixth anniversary by public exercises in the Central church, on Monday afternoon, May 26. Rev. Dr. Pierce, the President of the Society, presided, and opened the meeting with some remarks. The Treasurer's Report was read. Rev. Mr. Butler, Agent of the American Bible Society, presented some statements in regard to its operations. Addresses were then made by Rev. Messrs. Robbins, Burrill, and Rogers, all of Boston.

The AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY celebrated its seventeenth anniversary in the Central church, on Monday evening, May 26, S. E. Coues, Esq., the President, in the chair. An abstract of the Annual Report was read by Rev. Mr. Beckwith, the Secretary. An Address, prepared at the request of the Executive Committee, was then delivered by Hon. William Jay of New York. After the audience had retired, the business of the Society was transacted by its members. A resolution was passed, inviting

"The friends of Peace throughout the world to assemble, by their delegates, in the city of Boston on the last Wednesday of May, 1846, or at such time as may be deemed expedient on consultation with the friends of peace in other countries, to hold a second General Convention for the promotion of permanent and universal peace."

The following resolution was also passed: —

"*Resolved*, That whatever be the views of members of this Society upon other philanthropic movements, this Society, in its purposes and measures, as a body and through its agents, confines itself strictly to the object expressed in its Constitution, viz. the abolition of war."

The PRISON DISCIPLINE SOCIETY held its twentieth annual meeting in the Park Street meetinghouse, on Tuesday forenoon, May 27, President Wayland in the chair. The Report was read by Mr. Dwight, the Secretary; after which addresses were made by G. T. Bigelow, Esq., Charles Sumner, Esq. and Dr. S. G. Howe, of Boston,

and Judge Edmonds of New York, by whom the comparative merits of the Auburn and Pennsylvania systems of penitentiary discipline were discussed. A Committee was appointed to examine and report on the subject. We are glad that this measure was adopted, in justice both to the subject, and to those who advocate the system of separate confinement.

The MASSACHUSETTS CONVENTION OF CONGREGATIONAL MINISTERS met, as usual, on Wednesday afternoon, May 28. Rev. Parsons Cooke of Lynn was chosen Second Preacher for the next year, in case of failure on the part of Rev. Dr. Lamson, having received 91 votes out of 118. A Report was presented from a Committee appointed last year upon the question, whether ministers having temporary charge of congregations are members of the Convention. After discussion the Report was recommitted until the next year. On Thursday, the annual Sermon was preached in the Brattle Street meetinghouse by Rev. President Hopkins of Williamstown, from Romans viii. 22 and 19.

The CONGREGATIONAL CHARITABLE SOCIETY, on Monday, May 26; the EVANGELICAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY, on Wednesday; the SOCIETY FOR PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL among the Indians and others in North America, on Thursday; the SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, PIETY, AND CHARITY, on Friday; and the BOOK AND PAMPHLET SOCIETY, on Monday, June 2; held their annual meetings in private, for the choice of Officers and other usual or necessary business.

We have no room left, to take even the briefest notice of the meetings of the Massachusetts Colonization Society, at which Professor Greenleaf of Cambridge presided; of the three Societies devoted to the interests of the Anti-Slavery cause, one of which allowed, if not encouraged, an intemperance of abuse of the Christian Church and the American Union, that at last caused a dissolution of the meeting amidst confusion and darkness; of the Temperance Union and Washingtonian Mass Convention, which were held on successive days; of the New England Fourier Convention, where we understand there was much eloquent speaking; of the Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, which held its first anniversary this year; and of we know not how many other Associations, which took advantage of the concourse of people in the city that week, to present their claims to public favor. Besides which the Trinitarian Congregationalists and the Baptists celebrated their religious anniversaries, even the titles of which we are unable to give. It was indeed a week of excitement and employment. Most of the meetings, of every description and in the various denominations, were fully attended, and words of hope and encouragement seemed to prevail at them all.

Ordinations and Installations. — Rev. MORDECAI DE LANGE was ordained as an Evangelist, in the Unitarian church at ST. LOUIS, Mo., with a special reference to his taking charge of the ministry-at-large in that city, May 4, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Moore of Quincy, Ill., from Matthew x. 8; the Ordaining Prayer, and the Right Hand of Fellowship were offered by Rev. Mr. Eliot of St. Louis. Mr. De Lange was by birth and education a Jew, but was baptized into the Christian faith a few years ago by Rev. Mr. Eliot,

and has since been preparing himself, both by study and practice, for the work to which he is now devoted.

Rev. CLAUDIUS BRADFORD, late of Hubbardston, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in BRIDGEWATER, Mass., May 7, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of New Bedford, from Acts iii. 15; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Whitman of East Bridgewater; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Moore of Duxbury; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Moseley of Scituate; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Dr. Kendall of Plymouth, and Messrs. Brigham of Taunton, and Sanger of Dover.

Rev. JAMES L. STONE, late of Mansfield, was installed as Pastor of the Congregational church in BREWSTER, Mass., May 14, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Stone of Sherburne, from John xviii. 38; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Wight of Dennis; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Palfrey of Barnstable; the Right Hand of Fellowship, and the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Thomas of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Palfrey, and Pratt of Brewster.

Rev. CRAWFORD NIGHTINGALE, of Providence, R. I., was installed as Pastor of the Unitarian Congregational Church in CABOTVILLE, Mass., May 14, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York, from Matthew xix. 17; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Dr. Peabody of Springfield; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Hall of Providence, R. I.; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Whitney of Brighton; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Ellis of Northampton, and Everett of Northfield.

Rev. EDWIN J. GERRY was ordained as an Evangelist, at Lowell, May 15, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston, from Ephesians iv. 11, 12, 13; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. White of Littleton; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Miles of Lowell; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Wood of Lowell; and the other services by Rev. Messrs. Wood and Miles. Mr. Gerry has accepted an invitation to spend a year with the people at Athol.

Rev. LINUS HALL SHAW, late of Hampton Falls, N. H. was installed as Pastor of the Church and Society of the First Parish in SUDBURY, Mass., June 3, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Boston, from 2 Thessalonians iii. 1, 2; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Alger of Marlboro'; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro'; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Frost of Concord; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Barry of Framingham; and the other services by Rev. Dr. Field of Weston, and Rev. Messrs. Kingsley of Stow, and Gannett of South Natick.

Dedication. — The Unitarian church in Montreal, Canada, was dedicated on Sunday, May 11, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, from 2 Corinthians iv. 13; the other services being conducted by Rev. Mr. Cordner, the minister of the congregation. This is the first Unitarian place of worship bearing the name, that has been erected in the British Provinces.

OBITUARY.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, LL. D., died at Salem, Mass., May 8, 1845, aged 61 years. Mr. Saltonstall was descended from one of the most distinguished of the fathers of this Colony, whose sons have from generation to generation been eminent benefactors to their country by securing its liberties and advancing the interests of religion and learning. He was born in Haverhill in 1783, and having graduated at Cambridge in 1802, entered upon the study of the law and was called to the bar at Salem. By his fine talents, his industry, and his pure and upright character, he soon secured the respect and esteem of his contemporaries and the public confidence, and placed himself in the first rank of his profession. He was distinguished by just and discriminating views of legal subjects, by his open and generous manner of conducting himself to his adversaries, and by perfect fidelity to his clients; as well as by his invariable love of truth and regard for justice. He was early introduced into public life by the suffrages of his fellow-citizens, and so ably and so beneficially did he discharge the duties entrusted to him, whether in the Legislative bodies of his native State or in the national Congress, that he secured universal respect and admiration; for no political opponent ever doubted his integrity or the purity of his motives. He had so true a discernment of moral truth, that he arrived almost by intuition at his estimates of the tendency of opinions and actions in the conduct of life; and he enforced his views with fervid and earnest eloquence, which always produced conviction on honest minds. He possessed great disinterestedness in his intercourse with others, combined with a freshness and simplicity of feeling, rarely witnessed in one whose walk has been among the thickest press of human life for more than half a century; and it may be truly said of him, that the purity of his mind was proof against the contamination of the world, which he passed through without a single stain. In private life, he could be known and appreciated only by his family and intimate friends, and it is here that it is most desirable to present his image and example to others. He was kind and considerate of the feelings of all around him, and quite forgetful of himself; promoting gaiety by his cheerfulness, and communicating the stores of his large experience and various knowledge; and urging the obligations of duty, in a manner so persuasive as to make the aged thoughtful, and impress the principles of honor and virtue on many a youthful mind. But it is for his religious character that he is to be valued most. His excellent and pious parents, who were strictly Orthodox in their belief, imbued his infant mind with a fear of God and a reverence for religion, which never left him, and were the foundations of his character in mature life. As his mind expanded, his views were enlarged by a careful study of the Scriptures, his opinions became more liberal, and his faith more cheerful. Religion was to him the sunshine of the soul. Gratitude for every blessing of his happy and successful life, and resignation and peace at its unlooked for and painful close, were the blessed fruits of his deep and increasing piety. Few laymen were more learned in theology, or studied more deeply the Christianity of the Bible, and none had firmer convictions of the truth of its evidences or the obligations of its doctrines. He considered the former to be

essential to the latter, and humbly rested his hopes of immortality on the supernatural proofs which the Scriptures afford. He was a serious, though rational observer of the Sabbath, and unvarying in his attendance on public worship, and was much engaged in promoting Sunday schools, and other institutions for instructing the young and ignorant. Happy will it be for those who imitate Mr. Saltonstall, in his life or in his death. M.

Rev. EDWARD HENRY EDES died at Boston, May 30, 1845, aged 42 years. Mr. Edes was a native of Boston, and entered Harvard College in 1819. Circumstances prevented his finishing his collegiate course, and leaving Cambridge he engaged in more active pursuits. Having been unfortunate in business, and becoming deeply interested in the subject of religion, he entered the Theological School at Cambridge, where he completed the usual course of study in 1831. On the 15th of November, 1831, he was ordained as Pastor of the Unitarian church in Eastport, Me.; where he remained till 1836, when, finding the duties of this isolated situation too arduous for his strength, and the climate uncongenial to his health, he accepted an invitation to take charge of the Unitarian congregation in Augusta, Me. After laboring among them for more than three years, he closed his ministry in that place, and was soon after invited to settle at Kennebunk, Me., where he was installed, October 23, 1839. Here he continued to preach till November 1844, when he was obliged by pulmonary disease to relinquish the services of the pulpit. After lingering some time at Kennebunk, he came to Boston for medical advice, but soon declined, and never recovered sufficient strength to return home.

Mr. Edes was one, whose pure spirit and exemplary deportment secured the esteem and commanded the respect of all who knew him. He was modest and retiring, but at the same time firm and unwavering in his devotion to truth and duty. As a student he was careful and thorough in his investigations, seeking clear views and settled conclusions, and ever remaining steadfast to his convictions. He wrote slowly and carefully, and sought in his preaching rather to enlighten the mind and convince the understanding than to excite the feelings. He cherished an intelligent and firm faith in the doctrines of Unitarianism. They were dear to his heart as the source of his piety, the support of his spiritual life, the foundation of his hopes of heaven. He was never fond of putting them forward as a zealous controversialist, but was ever ready to defend them when assailed, or to present an exposition of them in connection with the practical inferences which naturally flow from them. In regard to the various moral movements of the day, while he was by no means a noisy advocate, he was always a firm friend to them, ever speaking decidedly and acting promptly, according to his convictions of duty and without regard to the fear or the favor of men. He was not a man who among strangers would attract notice and become popular at once, but the more he was known, the more was he respected, esteemed, beloved. He enjoyed the free exercise of his mental powers to the last, was perfectly sensible of the nature and progress of his disease, and fully resigned to the will of God in regard to the result. He wasted gradually away without acute suffering, and fell sweetly asleep in the joyful hope of a glorious resurrection. W.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

SEPTEMBER, 1845.

Art. I. — STRAUSS'S LIFE OF JESUS: — THE MYTHIC THEORY.*

It may be doubted whether any work of modern times has produced so great an excitement as the "Life of Jesus," by Dr. Strauss. Of this, the fortunes of its author are an indication. Before his second volume had

* 1. *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet.* Von David Friedrich Strauss, Dr. u. s. w. Tübingen, 1835, 1836. Two volumes. 8vo. pp. 732 and 750. [The Life of Jesus, critically examined. By D. F. Strauss.]

2. *Strauss, Hegel and their Opinions.* By the Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D. 8vo. pp. 50.

A Reply to the Life of Jesus, by Dr. Strauss. From the French of Professor Quinet, and the Rev. Pasteur A. Coquerel. 8vo. pp. 66.

The Credibility of the Evangelical History Illustrated, with reference to the "Leben Jesu" of Dr. Strauss. From the German of Dr. A. Tholuck. 8vo. pp. 62.

The Fallacy of the Mythical Theory of Dr. Strauss, illustrated from the history of Martin Luther, and from actual Mahommedan myths of the Life of Jesus. 8vo. pp. 46.

The Theory of Myths, in its application to the Gospel History, examined and confuted. By Dr. Julius Muller. 8vo. pp. 42.

Illustrations of the Moral Argument for the Credibility of the Gospels. By the Rev. J. R. Beard, D. D. 8vo. pp. 101.

Passages from Neander's Life of Christ, selected and abridged, with reference to Strauss's "Leben Jesu." 8vo. pp. 72. London and Manchester, 1844, 1845.

appeared, the government of Wurtemberg removed him from his office in their theological school, but bestowed upon him other employment. Being afterwards appointed to a Professorship of Divinity at Zurich, public sentiment not only compelled him to resign, but produced a revolution in the government of the Canton. The freedom with which he made known his views, with consequences like these before him, is honorable to his candor and his courage. Equally honorable to his learning and acuteness is the manner in which his task has been discharged. In some respects the work is an important contribution to the theological literature of the age. It is valuable for the masterly manner in which it has exposed the absurdities of the Rationalistic system, that of Paulus, Venturini and others, — for the demonstration it has incidentally and unintentionally given, of independence of each other in the four historians of our Saviour's words and actions, — and especially, as we think, for its own entire failure to render probable the mythic theory, the only one which itself has left to explain away the miracles of the New Testament.

The absolute incredibility of miracles is the very starting-point of the work. In the first section of his Introduction, the author declares, that when the intelligence of an enlightened age is brought to bear upon the ancient records of a religion, "every immediate interference of the Divine with the human loses its probability." The effort of enlightened interpretation then will be, either to show that what is recorded as miraculous never happened, or that it happened in a manner not miraculous. Both these modes have been pursued with regard to the wonders recorded in the Scriptures.

While Origen, and others treading in his steps, have endeavored to lessen the difficulty of receiving the records of Christianity, as well as the Old Testament, by representing them as to a great extent allegorical, others in various ages have insisted on the historical character which the system obviously claims, but have made that claim an objection to the religion. Thus did Celsus and Porphyry in ancient times; thus the leading English deists, and the author of the Wolfenbüttel manuscripts, (S. H. Reimarus,) edited by Lessing. These later writers are classed by Strauss under the name of Naturalists. The Wolfenbüttel fragmentist

represents Moses and Jesus as political deceivers, and the death of the latter as an event unexpected by himself, and which his disciples could only meet by feigning an account of his resurrection, and by altering the system of instruction which he had left.

From the last named theory that of the earlier Rationalists differed in this, — they claimed to stand on Christian ground. Like the Naturalists, they regarded Christianity as founded on facts, historical, but not miraculous; but while the Naturalists represented the Founder of the religion and his followers as intentional deceivers, the Rationalists saw in Jesus a virtuous man, and in the historians of his life, persons who believed what they wrote. The distinction thus made in the use of terms is not strictly observed by our author, nor we think generally recognized among scholars; and as the mythical school, which Strauss himself represents, may be regarded as a section of the Rationalistic, we shall apply the term, Naturalist, to the class of authors, at least nominally Christian, who, without resorting to the idea of myths, explain the miracles on what they consider natural principles. Views of this description, but relating to the Old Testament, were presented by Eichhorn in reply to the the Wolfenbüttel fragmentist. In the early existence of all nations, according to Eichhorn, it has been customary to ascribe remarkable events to the direct interposition of some divine power. This was done in good faith, among the Hebrews as among others. The evidences of uncommon wisdom which such a leader as Moses gave, passed among his countrymen for miracles; not through his intention, but through their ignorance, in which perhaps he himself sometimes shared.

"His calling was nothing else, than that this patriot, when the long cherished thought of delivering his people returned to him with uncommon vividness in a dream, held this for a divine monition. The smoke and burning of Sinai at the giving of the Law, were but a fire which Moses had kindled upon the mountain, for the purpose of producing an effect upon the imagination of the people," [something like intentional deception here!] "with which accidentally a heavy thunderstorm coincided. The shining of his countenance, finally, was the natural result of great excitement, which not only the people, but Moses himself, as he knew not its true origin, considered as something divine."*

* Strauss, Vol. I., p. 19.

Eichhorn applied the same method, in comparatively few instances, to the explanation of miraculous narrations in the New Testament. Other writers, especially Eck and Venturini, followed in the path which he had opened; but the system was carried to its perfection by the celebrated Dr. Paulus. In his Commentary on the New Testament, which appeared in 1800, he "represents it as the first requisite for the inquirer into the biblical history, to distinguish what therein is fact, and what opinion." *

"The course, of which he has here to avail himself, is, where no parallel narration which has been kept in greater purity is at hand, to assist him in correcting the account before him, to place himself, in as lively a manner as possible, in the scene of the events, and in the point of view of the age, and from these to endeavor to give completeness to the narration, by restoring those explanatory circumstances which the historian himself, limited by his view of the transaction as supernatural, has often omitted to indicate." †

"Jesus is to him, not the Son of God in the ecclesiastical sense, but a wise and virtuous man; and what he performs are not miracles, but actions partly of friendliness and philanthrophy, partly of medical skill, partly too of chance and good luck." ‡

Venturini, already mentioned, brought out, about the same time his "History, on natural principles, of the great Prophet of Nazareth." (Natürliche Geschichte des grossen Propheten von Nazaret.)

While Paulus clung to the letter of the Scriptural narrations, but explained that letter by the most forced constructions, so as to make it appear that Jesus never wrought nor pretended to work a miracle; while Venturini supposed that, though a virtuous man and a great reformer, he acted by the aid of secret confederates, and deceived not only the people but his very Apostles; Kant, the great author of the Transcendental philosophy, proposed to treat Christianity as the wiser among the Heathens had treated the religions of their time, to select what was instructive in it, and find or force an instructive meaning for what was absurd. He would not have the preacher declare that the sense he gave to the words of Scripture was the one intended by their writers, but he might plead for it as a sense which the words would bear, and thus, without at-

* Strauss, Vol. I., p. 20. † Ib. p. 21. ‡ Ib.

tempting the impossible task of overthrowing the popular belief, might communicate, through its medium, the truths of universal religion and the principles of virtue. The great philosopher appears to have thought that this conduct would be honest, on the part of one holding the office of a teacher of Christianity.

The views thus far described are regarded by Dr. Strauss as unsatisfactory, those of Kant from their disregard of history, those of Paulus from their violation of the laws of philosophy. But the progress of research into the Grecian mythology suggested the application of the rules of interpretation there employed, to the records of the Old Testament, and eventually to those of the New. In 1802 Bauer published his "Hebrew Mythology of the Old and New Testaments." This author contended that injustice was done to his system, by confusing the idea of myth with that of fable. The Scriptural accounts were not fabulous, that is, not intentionally deceptive; they were mythical, either veiling great truths in a figurative dress, or describing real events in the form they had acquired from the exaggerations of popular tradition. The mythical interpretation, as applied to portions of the Old Testament, is honored by the great names of Vater and De Wette. To its further development, and its application to the Evangelical accounts of the life of Jesus, the work before us is devoted.

The idea of Dr. Strauss may be thus presented. We possess four narratives of the life of that person whom all recognise as the Founder of the Christian religion. These narrations, though generally supposed to be the productions of his immediate followers, are not proved to be such by evidence sufficient to destroy the presumption against them, arising from the miraculous and therefore incredible character of what they relate. It is easy to conceive however, that in the transmission from mouth to mouth of the incidents in the life of the great Teacher, among a people accustomed to believe in miracles, natural occurrences should become gradually and unintentionally converted into supernatural; and that wonderful actions, such as the Jews expected of their Messiah, should be spoken of as actually performed by him who was supposed to bear that office. With these historical myths might sometimes be

blended, in popular tradition, one of a philosophical character, — a narrative intended to convey some truth in the veil of fiction, but which, in transmission from hand to hand, was at length related as a grave statement of facts. The writers of the Gospels then, even supposing them to have composed their histories about thirty years after the death of Christ, might, according to Strauss, even at that time have received with full faith the miraculous accounts which they transmit to us.

It will be seen that upon this hypothesis, the genuineness of the Gospels, at least of those which claim Apostolical origin, must be denied. With regard to that of John, however, more than its genuineness is questioned in the course of the work. The opinion of Strauss is, that it was written at a later period than the rest, by some disciple who had derived his knowledge of Christianity, through the medium of others, from the Apostle John, to whom the author intended that it should be ascribed; that this author had a high reverence for the memory of the Apostle, and desired, as far as possible, to exalt him; that he was also deeply imbued with the peculiarities of the Alexandrian school, which appear not only in his introduction, but in the language ascribed by him to John the Baptist and to Christ. This writer, according to Dr. Strauss, is much less trustworthy than the other Evangelists; the conversation with Nicodemus is a philosophical myth, or rather in plain terms a fiction, even to the very existence of that person; the raising of Lazarus equally fictitious; and the conversations held by our Saviour with his Apostles, as recorded by this writer, deserving of no confidence. Strauss indeed modified these views greatly in his third edition; but the concessions which he then made, fatal as they threatened to be to his own theory, were explicitly recalled in the fourth.

In the investigation of any miraculous account, the mode adopted by Strauss is generally the following. He compares the statements given by the Evangelists, and observing those differences which unquestionably in many instances exist between the writers, he considers the simplest form of the narration as nearest to the truth. He recounts the difficulties which oppose the literal explanation; describes the attempts of Naturalist commentators, and refutes the grave

absurdities of those much-believing divines. He then applies the mythical principles of investigation, and endeavors to show how supernatural circumstances might have become clustered around some natural occurrence, or even some popular expectation. In this task the greatest assistance is derived from the supposed expectations of the Jews with respect to the Messiah. Popular tradition, we are told, would of course ascribe such actions to Christ, as were supposed to have been predicted respecting him. The prophecies therefore, particularly such as are in the New Testament applied to Christ, are supposed by Strauss to have wrought their own fulfilment, not indeed in the life of Jesus, but in the traditional record of that life. By reference to some passages in the Rabbins, the whole life of Moses is made equally available to furnish a foundation on which this early Christian tradition should construct its mythic life of Christ. Whatever wonderful works were done by the Prophets, too, the Messiah was expected to perform, — to give sight to the blind, like Elisha,* and to raise the dead, like Elijah, Elisha, and Ezekiel.† With all these means, it is no difficult task to find for every miracle of Jesus some ancient prototype, or popular expectation, which may serve to account for the origin of the tradition.

With regard to the actual life of Jesus, the foundation of reality on which this immense mass of fable has been constructed, the conclusions of Dr. Strauss are these. Jesus was a native of Nazareth, the son of Joseph and Mary; the entire account of his birth in Bethlehem, with its circumstances of danger and of miracle, belonging to that class of myths which proceed from the popular desire of glorifying the early life of distinguished men. Some exhibition of uncommon intelligence in childhood may have given rise to the story of his sojourn in the temple when twelve years old, though this is doubtful. He probably may have had some instruction from the Essenes, or from Rabbins and intelligent persons whom he met at the feasts at Jerusalem. At about thirty years of age he became a follower of John the Baptist, who appears to have belonged to the ascetic sect of the Essenes, and to have proclaimed the popular idea — very natural among an oppressed people, — that

* 2 Kings vi. 20. † Ezekiel xxxvii. 10.

the great expected national deliverer, the Messiah, was at hand. Jesus probably remained a follower of John much longer than the partiality of tradition would allow us to believe. At length he began to preach, — at first, the same doctrine with the Baptist, that the Messiah was soon to appear. Gradually, as he became conscious of his own extraordinary mental powers, the idea occurred to him, that he was himself destined to fill that office. His conception of the Messiahship, which at first may have been similar to that entertained by the people at large, rose with his increasing experience, until, applying to himself the prophecies of the Old Testament which speak of the servant of God as suffering, he was convinced that the violent death which the malice and power of his enemies rendered probable, was part of his great mission. Having exercised the office of a teacher of virtue and reprover of hypocrisy, he was at length put to death. He did not rise again, but the excited imagination of his followers presented his form to them in visions. A report spread of his resurrection, which was believed among his followers, and contributed chiefly to the success of his religion.

A more clear idea of the modes of explanation adopted by the Naturalists and the Mythic school respectively, may be obtained from the following example, the subject being the Resurrection.

Modern cultivation having, according to Strauss, fixed decidedly the dilemma, that either Jesus did not die on the cross, or that he did not afterwards live, the Rationalists or Christian Naturalists have adopted the former supposition.

"The short time that Jesus hung upon the cross, taken in connexion with the known slowness of that mode of death in other cases, and the uncertainty resting upon the account of the body having been pierced by a spear, (which we cannot by any means consider historical,) appear to render uncertain the reality of the death. That the executioners, as well as the disciples themselves, admitted no such doubt, may be explained not only by the universal difficulty of distinguishing deep swoons and cases of catalepsy (synkoptische Erstarrungen) from real death, but by the low state of medical knowledge in that age. On the other hand, at least one instance in which a person who had been crucified recovered, appears to make a restoration conceivable in the case of Jesus. This example is given by Josephus, who relates that of three of his acquaintances, whom he obtain-

ed permission from Titus to have taken from the cross, two died, the third was restored."*

Paulus accordingly supposes Jesus to have been taken from the cross in a swoon, and recovered by the effect of the powerful spices placed around him, while his wounds were mollified by the oils used in embalming. Another writer thinks that an earthquake and a flash of lightning, which occurred very conveniently on the third morning, contributed their aid. The powers of nature work miracles *ad libitum* in the explanations of the Naturalists, only these miracles are without any intelligent Cause, and for no high purpose. Bahrdt again supposes that Jesus, finding no other way to purify the generally received idea of the Messiah from its sensuous and political elements, submitted to be crucified, and feigned to expire; that he was consequently taken from the cross before death actually took place, and was resuscitated through the application of medical means by his secret associates. Others imagine him to have been thrown into a deathlike sleep by a draught which his confederates administered for that purpose. These various explanations, we presume, are all considered by their respective authors perfectly Christian. Among them, that of Paulus appears at first sight the most natural, as well as implying no dishonorable, deceptive or incredible conduct on the part of Jesus. But its utter impossibility is evident on a second glance. Strauss well observes, that from the account in Josephus, it is hardly possible that the three whose lives he besought had been crucified longer than was the case with Jesus, who remained on the cross from nine in the morning till near six in the afternoon; that of these three persons, who appear to have given signs of life before their removal, and who had the best medical care, two died; and that in the case of Jesus, the cold air of the cave and the strong aroma of the spices must have had rather an influence to prevent than to promote resuscitation. To this we may add, that resuscitation under such circumstances could only be to the most languid state of incipient recovery; while our Saviour was sufficiently restored, on the morning of the third day, to present himself in seeming health to

* Leben Jesu, Vol. II., p. 648.

Mary and others of the disciples, and on the evening of that day to walk with two of them to Emmaus.

While the modern Naturalists have adopted the opinions above expressed, the converse view was taken by Celsus of old, by the Wolfenbüttel fragmentist, and is sustained by Strauss, — that the death of Christ really took place upon the cross, but that the accounts of his resurrection are not to be believed. Strauss does not, like those with whom he agrees on this point, express any suspicion of unfair dealing on the part of the Apostles. He conceives the myth of the resurrection to have been fully believed by them; and his admissions here are of great importance.

"From the Epistles of Paul and the Acts, it is certain that the Apostles themselves had the persuasion that they had seen the Arisen."*

"For the rest, the passage from the first Epistle to the Corinthians is not hereby weakened, which, undoubtedly genuine, was written about the year 59 after Christ, therefore not thirty years after his resurrection. Upon this information we must admit, that many members of the first community, still living at the time of the composition of that Epistle, particularly the Apostles, were persuaded that they had witnessed appearances of the risen Christ."†

How then did this persuasion arise? The disciples had, previously to the death of their Master, derived from his discourses and his conduct a strong impression that he was the Messiah; this was, of course, accompanied with the belief, general among their countrymen, that the Messiah was to "abide forever." The events of his trial and death struck them with astonishment, and for a time overcame their faith; but as the first shock passed away, the former impression returned, and their immediate impulse was to search the Scriptures, their great national authority, to ascertain if even these overwhelming events might not be reconciled with the Divine commission of their Master. In this frame of mind, every passage which spoke of a servant of God as suffering and as dying, was at once applied by them to Jesus. Becoming thus convinced that his sufferings had been foretold, as a part of that which was destined for the Messiah, their former faith returned. Jesus was

* Leben Jesu, Vol. II. p. 656. † Ib., Vol. II. p. 629.

the Messiah; he "ought thus to have suffered, and to enter into his glory;" notwithstanding his death, he still "abode forever." Convinced that he still lived, imagination supplied the rest. The women first had visions; afterwards the men, even in whole companies, — "a height of pious enthusiasm," says Strauss, "which in other cases occurs with religious communities, especially when oppressed and persecuted." It is to be regretted however, that our author does not bring forward any instance of this astonishing kind, which we might examine and compare with the records of the Evangelists. But to return; — the disciples easily concluded that their Master had not only risen spiritually, but that his body had left the grave, by the application of those passages of the Old Testament, which they, and others since, have considered as prophetic of that event, as Psalm xvi. 10, Isaiah liii. 10.

To this the replies are obvious; — that the time, the interval of one day and two nights after the crucifixion, is much too short to allow of such a change in all the feelings of the disciples; that the accounts describe Jesus as not only appearing, but speaking, partaking of food, and allowing the witnesses to touch his person and examine his wounds; and finally, that if Christ had not risen, the Jewish rulers would have crushed the religion at once by producing his body; for the supposition of Strauss is inconsistent with the idea that the body had been removed by the disciples. Our author takes refuge in the inconsistencies which he has endeavored to prove between the Evangelists; and deciding in favor of Matthew's Gospel, as approaching nearest to the truth, fixes the first vision of the Apostles in Galilee, where the impression of the disciples that they had seen their Master could not be instantly met by the production of his body. Even the relation of Matthew must be deprived, however, of all beyond the facts, that some women thought they saw Jesus after his crucifixion, and that some of his disciples subsequently thought that they saw him in Galilee. All that gives particularity to the relation of this Gospel and of the others, was added in the transmission of the original accounts from one person to another. By these traditional alterations, the flight of the disciples into Galilee after the crucifixion was transformed into a journey undertaken by their Lord's direction for the

purpose of meeting him there; the visions were increased in number, and enriched with various circumstances; and Jerusalem, the capital, and the seat of the first Christian church, was made the scene of some of them.

Such is a specimen of the mythical interpretation of Strauss. That it does violence to the Evangelical history, is an expression utterly inadequate to convey the obvious fact. It sets the Evangelical history at nought. It reduces the definite and particular accounts, in which all the Gospels agree, of a man in actual, tangible flesh, conversing and partaking of food, to an unreal vision of some self-deceived fanatics. The author, while professing to regard the Evangelists as only relating what they believed, supposes numerous incidents, whole scenes, affecting conversations, to have been created out of nothing, and added to the basis, itself the mere fancy of enthusiasts, until the whole cloudy mass composed the fabric of that faith which stood unshaken amid all the storms of persecution.

It is obvious that to the establishment of Dr. Strauss's theory, the want of genuineness in our present Gospels is a necessary postulate. If men as intimate with the Apostles as Mark and Luke, — still more if Apostles themselves, Matthew and John, — have left us records of the Saviour's life, the theory of traditional myths cannot stand a moment. We have the testimony, in one case, of those who received their accounts from eye-witnesses; in the other case, we have that of the eye-witnesses themselves. Now the proof for the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels, utterly deficient as Strauss regards it, has not appeared so to others. Let us cast a glance at two of the witnesses; a glance sometimes may discover the character of a man.

Who wrote the Gospel ascribed to Luke? Independently of the fact, that all Christian antiquity represents it as the work of that person, and that there is no rival claimant for the authorship, let us see what testimony the book bears for itself. The preface,* compared with that of the book of Acts,† shows that it was from the hand of the same author. Now it matters not whether this author's name was Luke, provided he was such a person as Luke is supposed to have been, — an intimate companion of the

* Luke i. 1 — 4. † Acts i. 1.

Apostles, and a faithful narrator of events. Through a great part of the book of Acts, the historian speaks of Paul's journeyings in the first person plural; as one in the company of that Apostle, and one not merely a follower, but entitled to be consulted in regard to the motions of the party. "Immediately," he says, "*we* endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called *us* for to preach the gospel unto them."* "And when *we* heard these things, both *we*, and they of that place, besought him (Paul) not to go up to Jerusalem."† As to his fidelity as a historian, let him who doubts it read Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ." He will perceive that the Epistles confirm the Acts by constant and unstudied coincidences; and he will remember that Strauss himself admits the genuineness of the Epistles. We have then the facts established, that the author of the third Gospel was a trusted companion of the Apostle Paul, and a faithful historian. The date too is fixed, at about the year of Christ 60, by a comparison of the commencement of the book of Acts with its conclusion. From the former we learn that the Gospel was written before the Acts; from the latter that the Acts were completed when Paul had been two years a prisoner at Rome. Having these facts, whether the author's name was Luke or not, the authenticity of his account — a point of much greater importance — is established. But, in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, the tradition which ascribes the books to Luke is entitled to full credit.

Let us turn to the Gospel ascribed to St. John. Much does Strauss argue against the genuineness of this from the difference which exists between it and the other Gospels, both with regard to the scene and the character of the Saviour's preaching. The "Synoptists," as he styles the first three Evangelists, represents Jesus as teaching principally in Galilee, — the fourth describes his ministry in Jerusalem. The usual way of accounting for this is that which early tradition furnishes, by informing us that John wrote his Gospel after the others, to supply deficiences which he had discovered in them. Our critic, however, endeavors to prove that the accounts are in many respects inconsistent. He succeeds in demonstrating what every

* Acts xvi. 10. † Acts xxi. 12.

biblical scholar knew before, that there are discrepances in individual portions. And what else, we may ask, could have been expected, in narratives written from memory, many years after the events they record, by persons whose minds were more full of the greatness of their theme than of the minute spirit of the antiquarian? So far from contradicting each other in their general scope, they are necessary to each other, as parts of the same whole. All that Jesus is recorded by John to have done in Jerusalem, is said to have happened at one or another of the great feasts. Where then was Jesus in the intervals, and how was he employed? The "Synoptists," in our view, answer the question, by describing his actions in Galilee. On the other hand, if these are taken as the sole authority, they leave us uninformed of his actions on those occasions when the Law, which he of all men would be most prompt to observe, required his presence in Jerusalem. Here the Gospel of John comes in to supply the deficiency.

Our author argues against the genuineness of the last Gospel from the peculiar style of language attributed therein both to John the Baptist and to Jesus himself. Yet what more natural than that words remembered to have been spoken long since, should, while reported with faithfulness as to sense, yet be modified in the form of expression by the mind which transmits them?

The internal evidence for the genuineness of this Gospel is unfolded in a masterly manner by our author himself, though while establishing the premises he strives to avoid their conclusion. He points out what he considers the constant effort of the writer to elevate the character of John. It is this Apostle who leans on Jesus' breast; it is he who is "known unto the high priest," and possesses influence with his servants; it is he who stands with Mary at the foot of the cross, and he who outruns Peter and comes first to the sepulchre. But with all this, there is a half-concealment of the individual's name. The person thus ever prominent is now "one of the disciples, whom Jesus loved," now "another disciple." The obvious conclusion from this would be, that the writer was himself the prominent actor he describes; that his own share in the events being what of course he was most familiar with, he had dwelt most on that; but that to avoid the appearance

of self-praise, he had adopted these circumlocutions instead of giving his own name, or speaking in the first person singular. But this conclusion would be fatal to the whole mythic hypothesis. Strauss admits that the author apparently wished his work to be considered that of John—(welcher sich wahrscheinlich als den Apostel Johannes zu errathen geben will), but supposes that he was actually an admirer of that Apostle, and indirectly his disciple (ein Verehrer des Johannes, vielleicht aus einer johanneischen Schule hervorgegangen).* Elsewhere however he reaches the conclusion, that the greater part of what this Gospel records of the teachings of Jesus is absolute forgery, or as he less offensively expresses it, "free compositions of the Evangelist."† It is easy to perceive the utter inconsistency of this conclusion with what has been previously laid down as the principle of mythical interpretation, in the distinction, for instance, made by Bauer between myth and fable. We cannot but express our wonder at the mental and moral constitution of the supposed pious forger. Notwithstanding the beauty of the sermon on the Mount, and of the parables given by the earlier Evangelists, none of the Gospels is, we presume, more generally the favorite among Christians than this of St. John. The discourse of the Saviour to Nicodemus on regeneration, the conversation with the woman of Samaria, the account of our Lord's sympathy with the bereaved sisters, the parting conversation and prayer, the incident of filial love when he hung upon the cross, the charge to Peter after the resurrection, — these are passages in the life of Christ on which peculiarly his disciples have loved to dwell. Yet these, according to Strauss, are the work of forgery, — of one who was "an admirer of the Apostle," yet who scrupled not to usurp his revered name for his own wholesale fabrications!

We are led to the remark in passing, how beneath the touch of the mythist all that is most lovely and holy in the character of our Saviour melts away, even though sustained by the comparatively authentic "Synoptists." Not only the last touching incident of filial affection, testified by John, is rejected, but the account of the penitent thief is discredited, and the sublime prayer, "Father, forgive

* Leben Jesu — Vol. I, pp. 562, 563. † Ib. — Vol. I. p. 675.

them, for they know not what they do," is considered as of doubtful authenticity. Truly, if the *caput mortuum* of Christianity which mythicism leaves us, be all that is true of our religion, our feelings would tempt us to forgive the Evangelists who have so beautifully deceived, rather than the critics who so coldly disenchant us.

The theory of Strauss respecting the authorship of John's Gospel is not only thus improbable in itself, but it remains to be explained how the forgery could have been palmed upon the Christian Church. The author is supposed to have been a disciple of a school established on the basis of John's teachings. How were the other members of the same school persuaded to adopt, as the Gospel of their favorite Apostle, a volume of narratives and discourses, scarce any of which they had ever heard of before?

There were indeed some Christians of the early ages, who were weak or wicked enough to write collections of legends, and endeavor to pass them off upon their brethren as the work of Apostles and even of their Master himself. We have these "Apocrypha of the New Testament," and by the strong contrast which they present, they confirm the authenticity of the canonical records. The miracles ascribed to Christ in the genuine Gospels are noble, and generally of obvious utility; the apocryphal ones are childish, and in many cases vindictive. As to their authority, the Christian Church has never acknowledged that of these Apocrypha, while from the earliest period at which we hear of our present Gospels, we find them received as the genuine productions of Apostles and apostolic men.

Much of our author's reasoning is employed to prove that the various Evangelists, in their accounts, contradict each other. The alleged discrepances however, after all the ingenuity which Dr. Strauss has devoted to their illustration, are but such as might be expected from faithful, but not infallible witnesses, writing several years after the transactions they record. One thing however is demonstrated, — and we have never been so impressed with the result as in reading these volumes, — the independence of the witnesses. There was no story carefully concerted between these writers. Their accounts of the transactions on the morning of the resurrection are all different. Let it

be admitted. In some degree at least the discrepances can be reconciled by supposing the writers to have had their information from different sources, and consequently to describe different parts of the same whole; and were it necessary to admit that something of mistake or exaggeration had become blended, in some or in all the accounts, with the great reality, the admission would be neither derogatory to the writers, nor to the religion. But certainly, among four historians recording the same event, if the later had knowledge of the writings of the earlier, and were at all careful to make their combined story plausible, the very appearance of inconsistency would have been avoided. From this and similar instances it appears, that the writers were independent and honest witnesses.

And setting aside all proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels, who in the natural order of events must these witnesses have been? We find four histories which have been received as authentic from the age immediately succeeding that of which they treat. Who probably wrote them? To whom would the Christian community look to write them? What persons would have been likely to undertake the task from a feeling that their accounts would be credited by their brethren? Surely those who either had some personal knowledge of the facts they were to record, or who had possessed intercourse the most direct with the original teachers or their immediate disciples. Could such persons have given such a perverted account of the transactions of their Master, as the author before us represents to have been the case? Did we possess but one Gospel, and had doubts been expressed from an early period with regard to the genuineness of that, as is the case with some of the general Epistles, the mythic theory would appear more plausible. If, while one Evangelist wrote as we now find that all did, another had given a life of his Master in which nothing miraculous occurred, and did both come to us with equal external evidence of genuineness, we should hesitate little in deciding between their claims to our confidence. If, again, we found but one miracle, or but a few, authenticated by the historians, there would be some ground for plausible objection. But all the four give records of such a kind, that either the ministry of Jesus was in its very nature and all its leading incidents

miraculous, or all those leading incidents have been misunderstood, magnified, and absolutely perverted by every authority to whom these writers owed their information.

And what time is allowed for this entire alteration of fact into fable? We know something, from other sources, of mythology, and of its gradual development. The following dates, from the tables in Bradford's Atlas, may show the length of time which in other instances has been requisite for such a purpose. The Argonautic expedition took place B. C. 1360, the war of the Seven against Thebes 1317, the siege of Troy 1280–1270. So much for the foundation of fact. On the other side, the age of Homer and Hesiod is fixed at B. C. 900, Æschylus 525, Pindar 518. Regarding then the siege of Troy as the last great event of the mythical ages, and Homer as the first great mythist, three hundred and seventy years elapsed before the actual champions of the siege were changed into the demigods of the Iliad. But even this period was not sufficient for the work of mythification (if we may coin a word) to be completed. The account of the siege of Troy, though given by the prince of poets, is sober history compared to the adventures of the Argonauts; and even these have something human in them, when contrasted with the still more ancient myths which peopled Olympus with its deities. Nor did those who thus became exalted into gods and heroes flourish in an age of intelligence and among a people acquainted with the arts, possessing a noble literature of their own, and having the means of access to other nations. Yet if Hercules was a champion who subdued wild beasts, tradition varied less from the truth in describing his achievements, after the lapse of four centuries, and under circumstances most favorable for its operation, than it did, if the theory of Strauss be true, in ascribing miracles to Jesus of Nazareth, within about thirty years after his death, in a civilized age, with thousands of believers on the one hand, and of opponents on the other, ready to detect and expose any misstatement.

Our author, though he does not assign so early a period as thirty years after the death of Christ to the composition of the Gospels, endeavors to prove that within such an interval the history of Jesus may have assumed the mythical form; besides admitting expressly the fact that the Apos-

tles believed in the resurrection of Christ. We are thus authorized to consider the interval just mentioned as that in which, upon his theory, the myths arose. Let us measure this period by comparison with known events. It is the same that has elapsed since the close of our war with England. The men who served in that war are among us, many of them not yet in old age. Are the events of that war so far turned into fable that any honest person now writing, though in the most careless manner, could misrepresent them, as, if the theory before us be correct, the events of the life of Jesus have been misrepresented? But not to avail ourselves of our author's concessions, let us take an example from transactions more distant, and in their character more analogous to those of the Gospel history. About a hundred years have passed since the great revival commenced, in which Whitefield bore so distinguished a part. Can we conceive two, three, or four persons, separately undertaking at the present day to write the history of that excitement, with honest intentions, yet each perverting nearly every incident, making wonders out of common events, and giving an entirely incorrect idea, but each the same idea, of the claims and characters of the persons they describe? Still further, can we conceive of these legends as received by the present age as true? It may be said, that the present age affords no fair parallel to that in which the Gospels were produced. It is true, that the invention of printing has multiplied the means of detecting error; but it has also multiplied the means of its propagation. It is true, that the modern transactions we have named were events of public notoriety at the time they occurred; so was the crucifixion of Jesus; so must have been his miracles and his resurrection. "This thing was not done in a corner." The crucifixion took place in Jerusalem, at the great national feast of the Passover. It is well known, that at that time numbers were present in the city, not only from every part of Palestine, but from Asia Minor, Greece and Italy. Among these, the claims and supposed character of the sufferer must often have been the subject of conversation. In subsequent years too, not only the converts, but the opponents of the Christian cause had easy intercourse with Jerusalem, by those pilgrimages to the feasts which were so common.

The accuracy of the historians' statements, therefore, admitted of being readily tested on the spot where the events they recorded were asserted to have occurred.

The instances which our author brings forward to prove the possibility of mythical accounts arising in a comparatively short time, are such as show the weakness of his cause. Herodotus speaks of accounts of a fabulous character, existing in his time, respecting Cyrus, who died seventy years before. Not only is the period here allowed for the growth of the fables greater than any that can be probably assigned as occurring between the death of Jesus and the composition of the Gospels, but the historian was in one country, and the prince of whom he wrote had lived in another; the age too was far less advanced in civilization than that of our Saviour. Another instance however is brought forward. Herodotus commemorates some wonders that were said to have occurred during the second Persian war, only thirty years before his time. He gives the legend of the attack on Delphi being repulsed by an earthquake and the appearance of supernatural champions; that of the miraculous growth of the sacred olive at Athens, after it had been burnt by the Persians; and the phantom of a woman appearing at the opening of the battle of Salamis. These instances occur, however, unconnectedly, and are each susceptible of a natural explanation, leaving nothing to the myth but the exaggeration of some actual occurrence. But even allowing more than this, there should, to make the case similar to that of the Gospels, have been separate historians, relating not a few unconnected wonders, alleged to have taken place at distant points, but giving each a connected history, legendary in almost every particular, and without previous concert coinciding in the general features of this wonderful account.

It is in vain that the advocate of the mythical theory endeavors to separate the facts of the Gospel history from its discourses. If the miracles were not wrought by Jesus, we have no assurance that the words ascribed to him proceeded from his lips. We are aware of the reply which will be made to this assertion. The discourses of Jesus, we shall be told, bear the stamp of his own great and original mind; the writers who either invented or received with weak credulity the legends of his supernatural per-

formances, were not capable of originating such conceptions as those which they ascribe to their Master. This reply, however, cannot be legitimately employed by those who adopt the theory of Strauss, with regard to the Gospel of St. John. If the chapters in that Gospel from the thirteenth to the seventeenth inclusive could be forged, there is nothing in the New Testament that might not be. And it is perfectly inconceivable that, while almost every act of the great Teacher's life has been altered, magnified, and rendered miraculous by tradition, the same tradition should have left his instructions unchanged. If a person were to give us an account of an occurrence he had seen, and a report from memory of a discourse he had heard, in which should we suppose him the more likely to be accurate? In the one case there is the vivid impression produced by sight, and nothing is required in the witness but attention and the most ordinary share of memory. In the other, the train of thought which has passed through the speaker's mind must pass through that of the hearer, and leave there a distinct impression of itself. The argument must be understood, and its principal points distinguished from those of secondary importance; and after all, a repetition of the precise words of the speaker cannot be expected. If then the mythical explanation of the miracles be correct, no confidence can be placed in the fidelity with which the historians have reported the words of their Master; but if, on the other hand, those words by their beauty and holiness bear witness to their own origin, the conclusion that they have been faithfully transmitted to us leads to the conclusion, that the facts of the Evangelical history are equally authentic.

But this is not all. In many instances the supernatural narrations and the discourses are so connected and interwoven with each other, that even the ingenuity of Dr. Strauss cannot make a separation between them probable. This is particularly the case in the Gospel of St. John, where the difficulty is met by the sweeping accusation of forgery. But there are instances sufficient in the other Gospels. To take a few examples from that of St. Matthew, we find, chap. viii. verses 5–13, important assertions relative to the universal nature of Christ's religion, connected with the healing of a centurion's servant. In

chap. x. verse 8, the commission to the Apostles to perform miracles, occurs in the course of a long charge, from which we have no more authority to separate it than any other portion. In the same manner, in chap. xi. verses 4, 5, the miracles are appealed to as evidence of a Divine commission, in immediate connexion with the discourse respecting John the Baptist. In chap. xii. 9 — 13, our Lord's liberal doctrine with regard to the Sabbath day is stated and miraculously exemplified; and in the same chapter, verses 22 — 37, the healing of a blind and dumb person, who in the language of the day was called a demoniac, leads to the objection of the Pharisees, that Jesus wrought miracles by the aid of evil spirits, and to his sharp rebuke of their obstinate want of faith. In other cases, the performance of a miracle is accompanied by the demand by Christ, of faith on the part of the recipient; in others, by the repetition of the identical Syriac words employed, "Ephphatha," "Talitha, cumi," expressions which, as has been beautifully shown by an American writer, evince the deep impression which they made on the minds of the hearers, and thus confirm the truth of the whole account.

We can but briefly notice the very interesting concluding dissertation of the volumes before us. In this are described the different Christological systems of the Supernaturalists and the Rationalists; the eclectic Christology of Schleiermacher; the symbolical, of Kant and De Wette; and the speculative, of Hegel. Finally, the important question is discussed, what is the duty of one holding the office of a Christian preacher, and yet rejecting all that is miraculous in the Christian religion. Deeply interesting is this whole dissertation, as showing the efforts of powerful minds to unite a reverence for the Divine glory which they could not but acknowledge in the character and teachings of Christ, with that rejection of his supernatural claims which was with them a prejudice of birth. The great theologians of recent times in Germany were, we must remember, educated in an age of general skepticism. If this fact be kept in view, we may appreciate more candidly their motives and their efforts. To borrow an illustration from the quaint Carlyle, the "centre of indifference" at which some of them now stand has been attained, not by a departure from the "everlasting yea" of rational and consis-

tent Christianity, but by an advance from the "everlasting nay" of the French ante-revolutionary school. Believing that such has been the progress, we look with hope to see it continued. The land of the Reformation, we trust, may yet assume her due place in defence of rational, Scriptural, spiritual Christianity, in that great contest which is now approaching.

Thus far had we written, when the publications which are named in connexion with the work of Dr. Strauss at the head of this article, were placed in our hands. They form a series, intended to constitute a volume, under the title, "Voices of the Church in reply to Dr. D. F. Strauss," proceeding from the industry and zeal of our brethren in England, and particularly of Rev. Dr. Beard of Manchester, already so extensively and favorably known among us by his writings. After occupying the attention of our readers so long with our own investigation of the subject of this series, we cannot do full justice to the labors of Dr. Beard, and of the distinguished Continental writers whose works he has associated with his own. In the introductory pamphlet by Dr. Beard, we have, distinctly presented, the connexion of Strauss's peculiar view of the Christian Scriptures with his opinions as a philosopher. The clear and forcible statement of this tract shows, with how little propriety the author of the "Leben Jesu" lays claim to the character of an unprejudiced critic. Ranking confessedly with the "extreme left" or ultra portion of the Hegelian school, Strauss, as a matter of philosophy antecedent to historical investigation, denies the possibility of miracles, and the doctrine of an individual resurrection. "A life beyond the grave," he says, "is the last enemy which speculative criticism has to oppose, and if possible, to vanquish."* "When, in the first place, a solution of the difficulties which I find in the biblical history, satisfactory to myself, is put before me; and when, secondly, a solution of the philosophical views which I have against the possibility of a miracle, then will I allow myself to be convinced." "A miraculous operation upon natural objects,

* Strauss's Christliche Glaubenslehre, ii. 739; quoted by Dr. Beard, p. 21.

or products of art, — as turning water into wine, or multiplication of loaves, — admits of no possible explanation. Even the conception of such a possibility is so far out of the question, that I must lose my senses, before I could receive anything of the kind."*

To some, probably, the very fact that this author, supposed to be an impartial judge, has decided against the miraculous character of Christianity, may have had influence enough to unsettle their belief. Let such observe that he comes to his task with a foregone conclusion. Who could be admitted as a juror, with the declaration upon his lips, that he must lose his senses before he could believe in the innocence of the prisoner he is to try?

Of the tracts of MM. Quinet and Coquerel, two eminent French Protestant divines, the former is devoted to an analysis of the work of Strauss in connexion with those which had preceded it, and to a brief but forcible illustration of the unnatural character of his system, and its utter failure to account for the effects produced by Christianity in the world. M. Coquerel enters more at large into the illustration of similar arguments; and compares the growth of the supposed Christian myths in the space of a few years and in an intelligent age, with the actual production of fabulous stories relating to Charlemagne, in the course of four centuries of darkness. He points out the decided personality of such characters as those of Mary and of Paul; "the one encircled by a halo whose glory and purity are beyond the reach of human invention; the other assuming a genius too real not to exclude the idea, that his Apostleship was an enthusiasm and a falsehood."

One of the series is apparently an imitation of Archbishop Whateley's ingenious little work, "Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte." As Dr. Whately proved, by carrying out the principles of Hume, that the actions of the French Emperor had never taken place, so does Professor Wurm, the author of the pamphlet before us, establish after the manner of Dr. Strauss, the mythical character of most events in the life of Luther. The tract concludes with some extracts from Mohammedan stories relating to Christ, in some of which we recognise the absurd fictions of the

* Streitschriften, Heft iii. 18, 154, quoted by Dr. Beard, p. 33.

apocryphal gospels. These illustrate by contrast the genuine records, while they show what Christianity would have been, had it grown by traditional amplification, in the manner supposed by Dr. Strauss.

Besides the tracts already mentioned, we have translations from the distinguished German theologians, Müller, Tholuck, and Neander. The last mentioned divine has given a noble example of the manner in which error ought to be met. He prevented the work of Strauss from being made the object of legal prosecution in Prussia; but replied to its arguments in a manner so powerful as to lead in no slight degree to the alterations which Dr. Strauss made in the third edition of his work, — alterations so suicidal, that he afterwards hastily withdrew them.

The labors of our brethren in England have not however been confined to a republication of the works of Continental writers. Besides a general preface, and the introductory tract already mentioned, Dr. Beard has given us, in a pamphlet of about a hundred octavo pages, "Illustrations of the Moral Argument for the Credibility of the Gospels." With much vividness of delineation, he places before us the most interesting scenes of the New Testament history, and proves the truth to nature of the characters that appear. The portions relating to the recognition of Christ by his disciples after his resurrection, and their subsequent conduct, — the development of the character of Paul, and its contrast with that of his cotemporary Seneca, — and the pages devoted to the illustration of the perfect mind and heart of Jesus himself, may be designated as peculiarly interesting. If our limits permitted, we should be glad to extract these, and other passages. The whole series to which we have referred is valuable. We rejoice to witness this new offering to the best of causes, from the learning and talent of our brethren beyond the Atlantic. It is a cheering and a noble spectacle, — English Unitarianism, so long denounced as hostile to Christianity, yet standing, as in the days of Lardner and of Priestley, in the front rank for the defence of the truth of God in Christ. S. G. B.

Art. II.—MORISON'S LIFE OF SMITH.*

Judge Smith was not undistinguished among the eminent men of our country. To those who knew him in his later years he was an object of the deeper interest, because he seemed to belong to a period, not the least eventful in our history, when the great experiment of the Federal Constitution was undertaken, and the foundations of our prosperity and glory were laid. The time of military glory had gone by, and that of civil greatness had begun. Washington was engaged in a work of toil and difficulty, exceeding those of any of his hard-fought fields; — the task of recommending the new frame of government to regard at home, and respect and confidence abroad, by dignity, firmness and equity in its administration; — a work which perhaps no one but himself could have accomplished, and which would scarcely have been accomplished even by him, but for the aid of the lofty minds and honest hearts that were with him in that trying hour. Among these good men and true, Judge Smith, though young in years, held no unhonored place. The intimate friend of Fisher Ames could have been no ignoble politician, nor unworthy man. Few things could be more delightful, than to hear him dwell, not with the usual garrulity of age, but with the animation and vivacity which never forsook him to his last hour, upon the men and scenes of former times; pouring forth, from the abundant treasures of his memory, anecdotes relating to them for which history can find no place, but which might add instructiveness and force to the lessons of history; making his hearers acquainted with the individuals of whom he spoke, by delicate and vivid touches, better than others could have done by the most elaborate description.

But it was not from his political character and labors, meritorious as they were, that Judge Smith derived his highest claim to estimation as a public man. In fact, political pursuits, however enticing to others, had but doubt-

* *Life of the Hon. Jeremiah Smith, LL. D., Member of Congress during Washington's Administration, Judge of the United States Circuit Court, Chief Justice of New Hampshire, etc.* By John H. Morison. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 12mo. pp. 516.

ful charms for him. He was educated for the profession of the law, and had studied it with unwearied assiduity as a science, at a time when most men were content to regard it as a mere instrument of professional success. When he took his place, as Chief Justice, upon the bench of the highest Court of New Hampshire, it was felt by all who knew him, that his wide and accurate learning, and comprehensive grasp of legal principles, were to invest that tribunal with a dignity and excellence it had never known before. Nor was the general hope deceived. It would not be easy to find a more emphatic proof of the sense entertained of his judicial merits, than the fact, that the Legislature, rather than lose the advantage of his services, consented to raise the salary attached to the office to nearly twice its former amount. This was an evidence of the general sentiment towards him: and the same sentiment was entertained by men, whose legal attainments rendered them most competent to judge. It is sad to reflect that the highest judicial reputation in this country, unless confirmed and preserved by the Reports of its decisions, after a short time lives only in the memory of the aged. But for this volume, the remembrance of what Judge Smith did to elevate the Courts of his own State, by introducing better modes of practice, and by making judicial decisions conform to the acknowledged principles of the law, would have almost passed away.

As a public man, therefore, Judge Smith well deserved the commemoration which he has here received; and we are bound to say, that Mr. Morison has executed his difficult and delicate task with entire success. He was so intimately bound to the subject of his memoir by personal regard, as to be under strong temptation to represent him, as Queen Elizabeth preferred to have her portrait painted, without a particle of shade; but his taste and just moral feeling have preserved him from this error; and the reader feels that the likeness is a true and honest one. Biographies, like monumental inscriptions, have been somewhat noted for what lawyers call suppression of the truth; a defect, not much to be preferred to deliberate misstatement. When, therefore, we find a memoir written without any design of concealing faults or exaggerating virtues, and find, too, that it gives no unfavorable impression of the person

who is thus commemorated, we see what is very grateful, though unfortunately very rare, a good biographer employed upon a worthy subject. In some other respects, too, Mr. Morison has shown unusual taste and judgment. He has not encumbered his pages with a mass of disquisitions, upon every topic which he happens to touch; nor thought it necessary to proceed upon the supposition, that his readers must be utterly incapable of drawing any inferences or lessons from his narrative without his special aid. Whatever he introduces in the way of comment or illustration, is brief and to the purpose; his reflections are just and happy; everything that is required finds a place, and an appropriate one; and his work, while nothing is excluded that the reader needs, is always animated and always interesting. No trivial merits these; as any one will testify who has looked into the pages of a memoir to find the history of a man, and found, instead, the history of a country or an age.

Judge Smith was born at Peterborough, in New Hampshire, on the 29th of November, 1759. His father, an immigrant from the North of Ireland, was a man of sense and principle; and his mother was one of those persons of unobtrusive excellence who exhibit in retirement the gentle virtues which would adorn a wider sphere. He was the fifth of seven sons. The history of his boyhood is instructive, as it shews what resolution and energy may do, to overcome many and serious disadvantages. In fact, one of the principal merits of this work is the distinctness and power with which it enforces the great lesson, which the young are very slow to learn, that genius without industry is of far less worth than industry without genius. To his latest hour, Judge Smith was constantly and laboriously employed. As virtue is sure to be its own reward, his occupation was his pleasure: and it marks the manliness of his mind, that he omitted no opportunity of impressing upon all the minds over which he had influence, the necessity of assiduous and constant labor, as the source of all improvement and success. His early opportunities of obtaining instruction were very limited; and, imperfect as they were, were frequently suspended by the necessity of laboring upon his father's farm. From his earliest infancy, the desire of acquiring knowledge was with him a passion;

a passion not so easily gratified as in our days of multiplied facilities; not the less strong, however, because it could not be indulged without toil and difficulty. He taught himself to write a good hand, by copying the writing of his father on birch bark, with ink extracted from vegetables. It is worthy of note, that the Bible was the book which he found beyond all others interesting and instructive. Many appear to think, that it is of little consequence what children read, if they can but be induced to read at all; while it is quite certain, that a very large portion of the books which are now set before them, and to which they may devote themselves with great apparent zeal, are as injurious to the infant mind as are the worst classes of novels to the more mature. Those who would form their children's minds to a just and manly literary taste, cannot do it more effectually than by inducing them to become familiar with the Scriptures, and interested in them. This can be done, and without much difficulty; and when it is accomplished, it will be found, that the most desirable of all possessions, just literary taste and sentiment, and sound moral principles, have been growing side by side. It was in fact, to the boy's knowledge of the Scriptures that he was indebted for being selected for a public education. Mr. Morison has given some interesting anecdotes of his infancy and boyhood, shewing that both gave promise of his future eminence.

In 1777 he was entered at Harvard College, and enlisted about the same time for two months in the army, in season to be present at the battle of Bennington, where his active military career began and ended. After remaining for two years at Cambridge, he left it in order to enter at Queen's (now Rutgers) College in New Jersey, where he graduated in 1780, a year earlier than he could have done at Harvard. He remained in his native place a year or two after leaving College; and at this early age was chosen by his fellow-citizens delegate to a Convention assembled to examine a plan of government for the State. In August, 1782, he began the study of the law with Shearjashub Bourne in Barnstable, Massachusetts, being at the same time a private teacher in the family of Brigadier Otis. Here he remained a year. The next year he spent at Andover, as assistant instructer to Dr. Pearson, then the Principal of the Acade-

my. In this capacity, he became the teacher of two Presidents of Harvard University, the late Dr. Kirkland, and its present head, and of the venerable Dr. Abbot, Principal of the Academy at Exeter. In 1784 he took charge of a small school for young ladies in Salem, continuing at the same time his legal studies under the direction of William Pynchon. In the spring of 1786 he was admitted to the bar, in the face of a strong opposition from many of its members, founded probably upon the interruption to his legal studies occasioned by his occupation as a teacher; certainly not upon any deficiency in the proper qualifications. He now entered upon the practice with ardor and success. He was repeatedly elected a member of the Legislature, and in the year 1790 was chosen as a member of the House of Representatives of the second Congress, which began its session in October, 1791.

We have passed hastily over these portions of his early history, which are illustrated by his biographer with much entertaining detail, because our limits will not permit us to dwell on them at large. He arrived in Philadelphia at the beginning of the session; and his first impressions in regard to all he saw were of a very unfavorable character. He complains of the citizens as a set of beggars, among whom "you cannot turn round without paying a dollar;" gaming prevailed to a great extent in private society; Congress itself lost something of its dignity upon a nearer view. The great scheme of Hamilton for the assumption of the debts of the States had been already submitted to Congress, but was not yet adopted. Another most important measure proposed by the administration was the increase of the army for the protection of the frontier. Both were opposed by Mr. Smith, who does not seem at first to have attached himself to either party. In the following Congress, to which he was elected with great unanimity, he began to enter with earnestness into the support of the administration; though with him, political ambition seems at all times to have been an object subordinate to that of professional eminence. His speeches, not numerous but well considered, are regarded by competent judges as sound and able. He took an active part in the debates upon the British treaty, in which his friend, Mr. Ames, won the highest triumphs of his eloquence. Judge Smith's

account of the effect of his remarkable speech will be read with deep interest. We copy a few sentences.

"My friend Ames on Thursday, (April 28,) gave us the most eloquent speech I ever heard. The impression was great; probably much increased by the bodily weakness of the speaker. His introduction was beautiful, and his conclusion divine! His words, like the notes of the dying swan, were sweet and melodious. I tell him that he ought to have died in the fifth act; that he never will have an occasion so glorious; having lost this, he will now be obliged to make his exit like other men. If he had taken my advice, he would have outdone Lord Chatham."—p. 97.

We remember to have heard Judge Smith remark, that he was requested by Mr. Ames, before the commencement of his speech, to cause him to desist, if the effort should appear to be beyond his strength. When he sat down, completely exhausted, he earnestly asked, "Why did you not remember your promise to stop me?" "I could not have done so," was the reply, "if I had known that the effort would be fatal."

Judge Smith was for three terms a member of Congress, and was chosen for a fourth: but being now married, and finding it necessary to devote his attention more exclusively to the practice of the law, he resigned his seat in 1797. He had by this time acquired the esteem and confidence of the most eminent leaders of the Federal party, with several of whom he was on a footing of intimacy.

Shortly after his retirement from Congress, he was appointed Attorney of the United States for the District of New Hampshire. He was also Judge of Probate for the County of Rockingham; and in February, 1801, received a commission as one of the Judges of the recently established Circuit Court of the United States. The act establishing this Court, by one of those violent party-measures of which our country has already seen too many, was repealed in the following year. Shortly afterwards, he was appointed Chief Justice of the Superior Court in New Hampshire. The salary of this office was but eight hundred and fifty dollars, nearly half of which would have been required to defray the necessary expenses of his travelling. He very properly refused to accept the office without some addition to the salary: there seemed, indeed, to be little reason why he should relinquish a professional practice

which must yield four or five times as much, to serve a people who appeared bent on devoting the whole bench to starvation. The Legislature, with a desperate effort of liberality, raised the salary to a thousand dollars, and he accepted the office; but finding on trial that the compensation was inadequate to his support, he addressed to the President of the Senate a manly appeal, in consequence of which it was increased to fifteen hundred dollars. This was undoubtedly the office, which his character and intellectual habits best qualified him to fill; and the manner in which he filled it has not yet passed away from the remembrance of his fellow-citizens. Every one felt that its duties were discharged with an impartial dignity, learning and diligence, which not many have shewn in equal measure, and scarcely any one in greater. Very much was it to be regretted, then, that his political friends, in direct opposition to his own wishes, caused him to be nominated, in 1809, as a candidate for the office of Governor; thus withdrawing him from the station in which he might have remained for many years to the great advantage of the public, and in which it was not easy to find a suitable successor, to place him in one of those popular tenancies at will, which he might fill but for a little time, and many others might have filled as well. He was elected but by a small majority; and before the expiration of the year, the very friends who urged him to accept the office, formally and courteously invited him to leave it, with the flattering assurance, that he was not popular enough to be re-elected. So it proved: and he returned to his practice at the bar. It was not long, before the Court which he had forsaken became so unpopular, from a prevailing impression of its incompetency, that the Legislature thought it necessary to find a remedy for the evil: and they found that remedy in one of the most pernicious measures to which a party, in its madness, ever dreamed of resorting. They could not remove the judges by impeachment, for they had been guilty of no crime; nor by address, for that was a process, for which there was no precedent: they could not impair the independence of the judges, but they could take away the bench from under them,— abolish the system,— do indirectly what they had no power to do directly; and thus subject the whole judiciary system of the State to the caprice of

every party majority that might float for the moment upon the troubled surface of the political pool. They established a new system, with judges very far superior to those who were thus superseded. Judge Smith, though the measure had never received his approbation, was induced, by the urgent persuasions of his friends, to accept the same office which he had formerly filled so well; and he discharged its duties with the same dignity and reputation as before, until in about three years a new party revolution "hoisted" the new judicial system, judges and all, by a similar "petard" to that which had prostrated the former. After this event Judge Smith returned for a few years to the practice of the law, until, in 1820, at the age of sixty-one, he retired from professional business.

This is but a very cursory sketch of the prominent incidents of his public career. The more full account of his biographer is made interesting by historical detail, which illustrates without incumbering, appropriate and just reflection, and entertaining anecdote. We are compelled to pass to a more still more hasty notice of the circumstances of his private and domestic life.

Judge Smith was for many years happy in his home. It was not until 1808, that his house was made desolate by a sad casualty, which deprived him of his youngest son, a child of much promise, whose loss inflicted a wound upon the father's heart, which time could hardly heal. In 1827 he lost the wife, who, for thirty years, had shared his joys and sorrows; a gentle, unobtrusive woman, who had been long confined by declining health almost wholly to the fireside. Shortly after, his daughter, in whom his own heart was garnered up, who was bound to him by the most ardent and confiding love and sympathy, and of whom the author has given a portrait, which, bright and beautiful as it is, is not more so than her worth deserved, became the victim of the destroyer of so many of the delicate and fair. She died, at the sunset of a lovely day in June, as the beautiful hues of the twilight cloud fade scarce perceptibly upon the eye. About the same time, his surviving son, the only member of his family whom death had left, a young man of high talent and generous affections, but too little prudence, was driven by lingering illness to a milder climate. There was little hope of his complete recovery,

but he went thither only, as it proved, to die. Some have condemned the freedom with which the biographer of the father unveils the errors of the son: but it may find a vindication in the fact, that he did it only to shew that the "weary sun made a golden set," that the troubled day was followed by a peaceful and a happy close. By these repeated afflictions, the father was left alone. He bore his sorrows with a serene patience, which was made strong by his religious faith and hope. One of the most interesting circumstances in this volume is the picture which it gives of the growth of religious feeling in his heart. He was always a believer in the truths of revelation; he always regarded the Scriptures with deep reverence and admiration. But it was not until he was touched by sorrow, that he proved the extent of the consolation, strength, and happiness that Christianity can give. After a season of desolation, through a second marriage his closing years were brightened by the enjoyments of a happy home. He reached the advanced age of eighty-two: and, what is certainly very rare, was cheerful, uncomplaining, interested in all around him, anxious to instruct and serve others to the last. His charities were liberal and unobtrusive; to the young, especially, he was a friend and benefactor; and his aid was rendered doubly kind and welcome by his encouragement and sympathy. The secret of his cheerfulness was the activity of a mind which "knew no pause, and left no void."

Mr. Morison has devoted several pages of his work, which it would give us pleasure to extract at length, to an examination of Judge Smith's religious views and character. He had been educated as a Scotch Presbyterian, and was early designed for the ministry. In the vigor of his manhood he gave his mind to an investigation of the claims of the Gospels to belief, and the result was a firm conviction of their truth and genuineness. He did not attach great importance to any particular form of faith or worship; but was ready to welcome all religious truth, by whatever lips it might be uttered.

"Judge Smith believed that there was, in the death of the Saviour, a significance not only deeper than that which is attached to the death of any other teacher from heaven, but different in kind. As to the nature of Christ, he dissented equally from

those who consider him only as a man, and those who worship him as God; agreeing with Milton in regarding him as the greatest of created beings, 'the first-born of the creation of God.' In his theological opinions generally, I think he more nearly agreed with the matured views of Milton, than with those of any other writer. He belonged to the true catholic church, and was ready to acknowledge any man as a Christian brother, who received the Scriptures as his rule of faith, and who strove to mould his life by their spirit. 'Yes,' he was accustomed to say to zealous but narrow-minded young men, 'that is all very well. It is the way for you to go, if you so believe in your heart. But it is not the only way.' And as he grew in years, and his faith was purified and strengthened by trial, he became still more catholic in his feelings, attaching more importance to Christian fidelity, and less to the formulas of creeds, and the rules of church discipline." —p. 505.

"No one could more respect the institutions and ordinances of religion, or acknowledge more sincerely the necessity of religious character and faith. But religion he did not regard as something apart by itself. It must, he thought, be inferred from the general tone and complexion of the life. If its power is in the soul, it will breathe out and make itself felt. He believed it a progressive principle, growing from day to day, especially through trials and sorrows, and subduing the whole man — thought, affection, conduct, will — more and more to itself. So he believed, and no one, I think, can read his life in a truly Christian frame of mind, without recognizing something of this spiritual progress in his own character." —p. 506.

We are sensible, that we have given a very imperfect view of the contents of this volume: enough, however, has been said, we hope, to shew, that no reader will fail to find it entertaining and instructive. The young especially can meet with no more valuable lessons to aid them in the formation of their minds and characters, than those which were constantly enforced by Judge Smith's writings, conversation and example. We wish they could have seen his bright and animated features, and his kindling eye, as he sat in the ample library of his pleasant residence in Exeter, breaking at once from his severer occupations to welcome a friend or stranger, as if there had been no such thing as care or business in the world; entering, almost with childhood's merriment, into the jest or amusement of the hour; bringing back the scenes and persons of the past by his fine anecdote or lively descriptions; pouring forth wis-

dom and wit, grave instruction, deep learning, and keen irony, with a copiousness never exhausted and never wearying; combining the vivacity of five-and-twenty with the best experience of three-score-and-ten; looking on this life with a bright cheerfulness, which affliction clouded but had no power to extinguish; looking forward to the other with serenity and hope. Those who knew him well will find pleasure in contemplating the portrait, by which his biographer enables them to recall him to remembrance as he was; and those who knew him not, will find it a fitting memorial of one, whose character and history are not undeserving of any man's study and regard. O. W. B. P.

ART. III. — ROSE'S TRANSLATION OF NEANDER.*

MR. ROSE's translation of Neander's invaluable history has now been for a considerable time before the public, and though it has received some notice in the "Examiner," the merits of the translation have not been discussed in our pages. We now revert to the work merely to offer some criticism on the translation. The volumes translated are the three parts of the first volume of the original, which has since been published in a very much improved edition, in two volumes, and called the first part. The second "volume," filling three separately bound parts, exists only in the old edition, is now out of print, and we may expect a second edition in a year or two. The other already printed volumes are still to be had in their first form, together with the second part of the fifth volume, which has just appeared. The work meets a want which has long been felt.

Of the translation, we select for the subject of our remarks the second volume of the English edition, as the more important, and as being the later, and therefore, it

* *The History of the Christian Religion and Church during the three first centuries.* By Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German by HENRY JOHN ROSE, B. D., Rector of Houghton Conquest, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Two volumes. London. 1831—41. [Reprinted. Philadelphia. 1843. One vol. 8vo. pp. 466.]

may be presumed, the better of the two. The translator remarks in his preface, that occupation with the affairs of his own church has prevented his "realizing" his "promise" of an earlier appearance of the volume; but this occupation seems not to have prevented his bestowing care on his work. Some prefatory explanations of German words, however, are not such as to give one full confidence in his judgment and acuteness. In explanation of the word "Anschauung," after quoting from Krug's Philosophical Dictionary, and Kiesewetter's Logic, he concludes, — "It will be seen from these extracts that in its *strictest* philosophical sense, *Anschauung* means an image of one outward object in the mind, conveyed thither by the sight." But this it does never mean. It is not the image (Bild), but the beholding of the image, the looking on it; and it is singular, that in his whole explanation he has not used these words of "beholding" and "looking upon," which are the most natural explanations of the term. "Intuition" — in its present use — is not a true translation of it, even when it is used merely of mental operations; for "intuition" denotes insight into some truth, or perception of some quality or relation of the subject that is before the mind, while "Anschauung" signifies simply the direction of the mind towards some object. "Intuition" may, perhaps, in some cases answer as a translation, but more generally *view*, *conception*, *vision*, better expresses the meaning. The translation chosen for several other words is also unfortunate. "Begriff," *notion*, Mr. Rose will render "conception;" and "erkennen" he will not represent by the word *recognize*, ("*recognition* of a thing as present, memory of it as past." Grew,) which has taken the place of the stricter *cognize*, (cognoscere) and signifies, according to sufficiently good authority, to take knowledge of a thing.

Turning from the Preface to the middle of the volume, the following is the first passage on which we fell, in which we italicise the words which we esteem to be erroneous:

"We must always bear in mind, that Christianity did not deliver to man isolated speculative ideas of God and divine things, *nor* a *ready-made* dogmatic system in a *settled* form, but announced *the* facts of a communication made by God to man,

through which man became placed in a new relation to his Creator, by the recognition and *application* * of *which* an entirely new direction and formation of the religious *feelings might be* produced, through which all that was before contained in *it would* receive an alteration and modification. The fact of the redemption of sinful man by Christ forms the central point of Christianity, and from the influence which the *application of this fact to the heart* must produce on the inward life of man, this new form or condition of the religious *conscience* arises, and from this again there results a new state of thought about divine things, which reflects the new world formed within." — vol. ii. p. 234.

Is this passage in itself intelligible? Does the second "which" refer to "relation"? To what does "it" refer in the eighth line? "Religious feelings" and "religious conscience" are both bad translations of "religiöse Bewusstseyn." "Aneignung," instead of being rendered by the word *appropriation* which answers to it, is twice paraphrased. It refers no more to the "heart" than to any other part of human nature. We give the original below.† The true English of it we apprehend to be the following:

"We must never forget that Christianity did not deliver to men *speculative knowledge* of God and divine things in separate items, a finished dogmatical system in a fixed form, but that it proclaimed *facts* of a communication from God to humanity, through which man was set into a wholly new relation to his Creator, and by the recognition and appropriation of which a wholly new character and frame of the religious consciousness are produced, whereby all that was before contained in it receives ne-

* In a note: — "Aneignung. Literally, appropriation, — i. e. application to the heart. H. J. R."

† "Wir müssen nur stets dessen eingedenk seyn, dass das Christenthum nicht einzelne *speculative Erkenntnisse* von Gott und göttlichen Dingen, nicht ein fertiges dogmatisches System in stehender Form den Menschen überlieferte, sondern dass es Thatsachen einer Mittheilung Gottes an die Menschheit verkündigte, durch welche der Mensch in ein ganz neues Verhältniss zu seinem Schöpfer eingesetzt wurde, aus deren Anerkennung und Aneignung eine ganz neue Richtung und Gestaltung des religiösen Bewusstseyns hervorgehen, wodurch alles früher in demselben enthaltene anders modificirt werden musste. Die Thatsache von der Erlösung des sündhaften Menschen durch Christus macht den Mittelpunkt des Christenthums aus; von dem Einflusse aus, welchen die Aneignung dieser Thatsache auf das innere Leben des Menschen ausüben musste, entwickelte sich diese neue Gestaltung des religiösen Bewusstseyns, und von hier aus dann eine die neue innere Welt abspiegelnde neue Gestaltung des Denkens über göttliche Dinge."

cessarily a new modification. The fact of the redemption of sinful man through Christ forms the central point of Christianity. Out of the influence which the appropriation of this fact must exercise on the inward life of man, that new frame of the religious consciousness was developed; and then, out of this a new frame of thought on divine things, reflecting the new inward world."

The next passage on which we opened was a quotation from Theophilus of Antioch, on page 237, where, besides other mistakes, the sense is spoiled by "zwar" (*indeed*, or *it is true*,) being translated "but." "But God has created, etc." We next turned to page 119, "Marcion and his school," and referred to the original only when we came to senses which we knew could not be there. "Christliche Interesse," Christian *interest*, is rendered "Christian feeling;" and still worse, in the same sentence, "das Christliche," the Christian *element*, which is said by Neander to form the key-note (ground-tone) of Marcion's inward life, is rendered also "Christian feeling," as if the matter turned upon sensibility. On p. 125, the error is repeated of translating "das Christliche," the "Christian character." On the same page, "to be hated and to suffer," is spoken of as "the *destination* of Christians," (die Bestimmung der Christen.)

On p. 110, by translating the subjunctives "erlaube" and "schrecke" as if they were indicatives, the English editor has given as the opinion of Neander what Neander only reports as the opinion of Tatian, that marriage is unlawful. It reads: — "St Paul gives permission in that passage (1 Cor. vii. 5,) only apparently; he withdraws again instantly from that which he permits, by saying, that those who follow his permission serve two masters." There should have been inserted, *according to Tatian*. The German Professor is the last to wish to force by the authority of St. Paul that single state, which he himself has chosen, upon all who acknowledge the Gospel. In the rendering "withdraws suddenly," instead of the livelier original, *immediately starts back*, as if in terror at the incontinency of the permitted state, we see the staidness of expression which we have long known as belonging to the decorum of the English Church.

There is no page which does not contain errors, and a general awkwardness and dilution dissipate everywhere the

force of the original. The translator particularly seems to be less skilled in the rendering of certain adverbs and conjunctions, upon which sometimes the connexion and force of several sentences depend. "Wohl" (meaning, *well, perhaps*) he translates "very," "fairly," or by some emphatic word quite contrary to its sense; "zwar" (*it is true, indeed,*) he renders by its opposite "but;" and in apparently more considerable words, such as the frequently recurring philosophical terms, although sometimes showing very good judgment in his selection, and always apparently anxious to the utmost degree to be faithful, he is, we cannot but think, often very unhappy. "Bewusstseyn," truly translated by the English *consciousness*, he renders sometimes "conscience;" "Richtung" (*tendency, character,*) still worse by "disposition;" "Erkenntniss" (*cognition, recognition*) by "knowledge;" "Begriff" (*notion*) by "abstract ideas;" that fine word, "Menschheit," exactly answering to our "*humanity*," he renders "human nature," and thereby, though the distinction is delicate, darkens not a few sentences; and he is seldom fortunate with those plagues of the translators of German books, "Anschauung," "Gemüth," "tiefsinnig," "einseitig," and the rest. Mistakes which may have happened from oversight, and which might be corrected in another edition; such as "zeitlicher Hülle," "veil, which was to be for a time," i. e. temporary, instead of *temporal*; or, "eine den Menschen erziehende Gottheit," "a Divine Being who draws man to him," instead of 'a Deity the *educator* of Man;' we do not lay so much stress on, as on others which are more inwrought into the work, particularly those which affect the connexion and relations of sentences. The translator uses relatives so as to refer to the wrong antecedents; he makes the wrong clause of the sentence assume the emphatic place; he loses the antithesis; he chooses often the most emphatic word to exercise his scrupulous ingenuity of dilation upon, and sometimes by obscuring the main point where the original is not too clear, makes a whole paragraph unintelligible. But it is best that we should show this by the quotation of some passages. Changing the italics of the book to capitals, we italicise such parts of Mr. Rose's rendering as are incorrect, and set by its side what we deem a correct translation of the whole, and in this we print

large the words which Neander has so printed, even where his translator omits this distinction.

"Such an opposition" (as that between esoteric and exoteric doctrines,) "*although* necessarily grounded on the very nature of the religion that preceded Christianity, *would* entirely overthrow the fundamental character of Christianity, because Christianity pulled down every such partition-wall between educated and uneducated," etc. — *Rose*, vol. ii, p. 21.

Such a separation, which had a necessary foundation in the ANTE-CHRISTIAN way of thinking on religion, must destroy the fundamental character of Christianity; for by that every such wall of division between educated and uneducated had been torn down, etc. — *Neander*, p. 635.

"Although the Gnostic systems *contained* elements *selected* out of various old systems of Religion, yet they can never be entirely explained from the supposition of an intermixture and joining together of these alone; there is A SOUL AND SPIRIT OF A PECULIAR KIND, which animates most of these *collections*. In the first place, the time in which they originated, has impressed upon them a wholly peculiar character, just as it often happens in times of great ferment, that certain *dispositions* communicate themselves to a whole series of spiritual phenomena, even without any outward connexion or intercourse. Now the prevailing tone in *most serious* minds of that time, was the feeling of *disunion*, *and* of being unsatisfied by the existing world; a longing which would overclimb the limits of the earth; a desire after a new and higher order of things. This tone *of feeling* pervades also the Gnostic systems, *and* Chris-

Although the Gnostic systems contain elements out of various old religious systems, yet they can never be explained as a mere mixture and combination of these; there is A PECULIAR ANIMATING PRINCIPLE which for the most part gives life to the combinations. In the first place, the time, out of which they sprang, has set on them a wholly peculiar stamp; as it may often be observed in times of great ferment, that a certain character imparts itself to a whole series of outwardly unconnected mental phenomena to which those times give birth. Now the ground-tone in many of the more earnest spirits of that period was the feeling of alienation, of the unsatisfactoriness of all that exists, a longing which would not limit itself to the earth, the desire after a new and higher order of things. This ground-tone fills also the Gnostic systems; but now it was influenced in a very especial manner by the power of

tianity worked in an especial manner on this tone; and without Christianity, the Christian Gnostic systems would have become an utterly and entirely different thing. The idea of REDEMPTION was that which formed the peculiar nature of Christianity; and this idea *suited (!)* that peculiar tone *of feeling* prevalent among those systems, although it could be embraced by them only in a partial manner, and not in its whole extent, and all the consequences *deducible from it*. The ideas of *restoring*" (as if *they* could restore it) "an harmonious tone to a world in which it had been broken, of *restoring* a degraded creation to its *original state*, of *restoring* the lost connexion between heaven and earth, of the revelation of a *mighty* and Divine life in man, elevated above the limits of human nature, *as well* as *the notion* of a new course of development, which had entered into the whole economy *of the world;* — these were the ideas which communicated a new and imposing character to Gnosis altogether." — *Rose*, vol. ii, p. 25.

Christianity, without which the Christian Gnostic systems would have become altogether a different thing. It was the peculiar, deep-lying Christian idea of REDEMPTION, which changed (umstimmte) this ground-tone of those systems, although that idea could be received by them only in a one-sided manner, and not in the fullness of its meaning and in all the consequences that spring from it. The ideas of a lost harmony of things restored, of a fallen creation led back to its source, of the connexion between Heaven and earth re-established, of the revelation of a superhuman, overflowing, divine life in humanity, of a new course of development, which had entered into the order of earthly things, —these were the ideas, which gave to the entire Gnosis a new and grand direction. — *Neander*, p. 635.

Setting aside a general awkwardness and obscurity in the translation we have given from Mr. Rose, the *main idea* of the paragraph, viz. of a "retuning" of the Gnostic systems by Christianity, seems not to have been perceived by him and is wholly lost; and an idea is introduced in the place of it wholly foreign to the original. Then in the last sentence nearly the entire sense vanishes.

Notwithstanding his general carefulness, he here and there *omits* sentences; as in the following, where the omitted clauses are the most important of all: —

"The *enquiries* which chiefly occupied them (the Gnostics) were these: How is the transition from infinite to finite? How can man imagine to himself the beginning of a creation? How can he think of God as the original projector of a material world *so* foreign to his own nature? Whence come those wide differences," etc. — *Rose*, vol. ii, p. 26.

The questions, which especially busied them were these: How is the transition from Infinite to Finite? How are we to conceive the beginning of a creation? How of God as the author of a material world foreign to his nature? *Whence, if God is perfect, the imperfection of this world? Whence evil, if a righteous God is the creator of men?* Whence those wide differences, etc. — *Neander*, p. 637.

These, by the way, are not "enquiries" (Erkundigungen, Untersuchungen,) but *questions* (Fragen). Why lengthen out "Urheber" into "original projector?" Because it was only through his *aeons* that God was made by the Gnostics the Author of the world? But this lies not in the word "Urheber"; and it lies not in the question, for when the question is put, the answer is not supposed to have been devised. — We will in the same manner put another paragraph on trial.

"In this *mode of representation* God appeared as the incomprehensible source of all perfection; and no *means of* transition between this incomprehensible Being of God, and finite existence, could be imagined." (But *means of* transition were exactly what could be and were imagined; the difficulty lay in imagining an *im*mediate transition.) "SELF-LIMITATION, A LETTING DOWN is the first beginning of a communication of life on the part of God, the FIRST REVEALING of the hidden God, from which every other revelation which unfolds itself further, proceeds. Now from forth of this first

According to this mode of conception God appeared as the shut up, incomprehensible source of all perfection; between this incomprehensible Essence of God and the Finite can no transition be imagined. SELF-LIMITING, LETTING HIMSELF DOWN, is the first beginning of an impartition of life on the part of God, the first BECOMING MANIFEST of the hidden God, from which all farther progressing manifestation of God goes forth. Now develop themselves from this FIRST link in the chain of life, first the manifold essential Powers or Attributes, which up to that first self-comprehension* were

* This word must be understood in a deeper than its ordinary sense, to answer to the German "Selbsterfassen" (κατάληψις ἑαυτοῦ). Until this

number of the chain of life there develop themselves, first, the manifold powers or attributes, which dwell in the very Being of God, which, up to that first *time of his letting himself down* had been shut up in the abyss of his Being, every one of which represents the whole Divine existence, in some one particular point of view, and to which, in this point of view (?), the names that belong to the Deity were transferred. These Divine Powers, *therefore*, unfolding themselves into substantiality, are the *seeds* and *elements* of all other developments of life. The life contained in them developes and individualizes itself constantly more and more, and in such a manner also, that the degrees of this development of life constantly go lower down, and the spirits constantly become weaker, the more distant these developments are from the first link of the chain. We must remark that a Gnosis which, in its endeavor to explain the incomprehensible, was for ever falling into anthropopathism, has here *unconsciously* attributed the relations of Time to the Eternal." — *Rose*, vol. ii, p. 28.

all shut up in the abyss of God's essence, each of which represents, from a particular side, the whole Divine being, and receives, in this respect, the names proper to God. These Divine Powers unfolding themselves into self-subsistency, are thence the germs and principles of all farther living development. The life contained in them develops and individualizes itself ever more, through successive descending orders of imparted life, in spirits, which become ever weaker, the more distant the point of their development is from the first link of the chain. — Insensibly here indeed the Gnosis, which in its endeavor to explain the incomprehensible, was ever falling into anthropopathism, transfers to the Eternal the relations of Time. — *Neander*, p. 639.

One would think that the translator had intended to give us, as a rhetorical ornament, after the manner of the poets and the "Quadrupedum sonitu," a likeness of that descending, weakening series in the paragraph itself. For

first κατάληψις ἑαυτοῦ, "which was hypostatized in the νοῦς or λόγος," the Divine Nature was an unfathomable abyss (βυθος) too great even for consciousness. In order to impart life it must first draw itself together into a conscious state. And this was the preparation for that condescension spoken of, which was the first act of creation.

ourselves, we prefer harsh shortness to dilution and amplification. The chief excellence of the English is its conciseness. The richness and majesty of the German consist in great part in its capacity of shutting in within the embrace of a single expression or clause, (like those ivory boxes they bring us from China,) one within another, and according to the succession of dependence or natural importance, all the specifications, circumstances and modifications which are contained in the thought itself, — the subject outside, the first qualification next within it, the ground of the same within that, and so on until we come to some circumstance in the centre which does not need any further laboring. We cannot well force our English idiom into a similar construction; but it is still worse when we break open the enclosing globes and string the whole succession of great and little circumstances at the end, (like the boys' "bobs" on a kite) hung together and upon the main matter by a row of rickety and indeterminate *whiches* and *becauses* and *whiles*, until "the spirits" become indeed "weak" and weak enough, and "the relations" not "of time," but of chaos and the void seem to be transferred to the subject-matter. We must sacrifice, if necessary, circumstantiality to force. We must not labor upon the qualification until we lose the thing qualified. We must not take an obscure adjective which the writer laid in the dark inside of his inmost box, and spin it out into a thread at the very point of the sentence. Any one who can use well the strong pregnant English adjectives, will be able to say in so many successive strokes what the German says under so many different enclosures, and leave the main subject after all at the end. The German construction imparts to the style a fullness, particularity, precision, and completeness of connexion, which we cannot by the same means attain; but we have, in their stead, ease, simplicity and suggestive shortness.

As to the rendering of single words, few translators seem to be aware of the richness of our English tongue. Few ideas fail of finding in it an answering word, though the same may have been somewhat injured by incorrect, indeterminate or vulgar use. When the word answering to the word to be translated has not the fullness of meaning we could wish, we should yet use it, rather than a word

which stands either on one side or on the other of the thought, and also rather than describe the meaning by a periphrasis, which after all is of little help. If the German housewives have a mousetrap, which not only catches mice, but pulls out their teeth, there is no reason for calling it on that account either squirrel-cage, or rat-nest, nor for describing it in every instance in which it is mentioned as a mousetrap "which also at the same time extracts the teeth of the animal;" but simple mousetrap is the name of the thing, and its extraordinary powers may be inferred.

Now the same may be said, for instance, of the German word "Bewusstseyn." It means *consciousness*. And because the Germans comprehend under it, not only consciousness of the mind's own states and actions, but also a sense of anything spiritual the notion of which lies in the mind, there is no reason for rendering it either *conscience* (Gewissen) on the one hand, or *feeling* (Gefühl) on the other, or in any other way than by that word which really answers to it, which arose in our language in the same manner, and to express precisely the same idea, and which would receive the same extension of meaning by being used in the same discussions. Fifty years ago "Bewusstseyn" meant nothing more in Germany than "consciousness" in English. Chiefly by Schleiermacher has its sense been heightened. Writers speak now of a "Gottesbewusstseyn," which means not only the actual sense of God in the soul, but also the capacity of such a sense, or as we might say the sense *for* God; not only the action, but the faculty. But the English word will hold this sense, as well as the German.

To all that we have said it must be added, that Rose's translation is made from the first edition of the history, and that the second edition which appeared in 1841—43 is so changed that no one can consider the former as representing adequately Neander's views. No one in Germany would think of studying the old edition. And it is a great pity it has been so widely spread in England and in this country.

We have made these strictures on the work under notice, not from any fondness for petty and verbal criticisms, nor from a wish to disparage the evident respectableness, learning and fairness of the translator; but for the sake of

saving the history itself. How many years, how many centuries, have we waited and sighed for a good history of our religion and church! At last it has come. It is a work meant not for one nation, but for the world. As elements from all nations flowed together into the author's richly fraught mind to give birth to the history, so the history is meant to repay the debt by flowing back to them. It is of the greatest importance that it should not be troubled or changed. We earnestly desire a good English translation; and we cannot but express the hope that it will be prepared by some one more thoroughly conversant with the German language, and one who will labor after conciseness and clearness. The matter is of much more importance than some imagine, for if a bad translation gets possession of the market and of libraries, who will be encouraged to bestow the time and labor necessary to make a better, under the uncertainty of procuring publisher or purchasers and in the certainty of not earning his bread? A contemporary journal informs us that there is an American translation of the work now lying in manuscript ready for the press, whenever a publisher can be found. We know nothing of the translator personally, but he enjoys the reputation of being competent to the task. G. F. S.

Art. IV.—POETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

I. NO HEART ALONE.

"I have learned, says the melancholy Pestalozzi, that in this wide world no one heart is able or willing to help another."—Emerson.

O say not we through life must struggle,
Must toil and mourn, alone;
That no one human heart can answer
The beatings of our own.

The stars look down from the silent heavens
Into the quiet stream,
And see themselves from its dewy depths
In fresher beauty gleam.

The sky with its pale or glowing hues
  Ever painteth the wave below,
And the sea sends up its mists to form
  Bright clouds and the heavenly bow.

Thus each does of the other borrow
  A beauty not its own:
And tells us that no thing in nature
  Is for itself alone.

Alone amid life's griefs and perils,
  The stoutest soul may quail;
Left to its own unaided efforts,
  The strongest arm may fail.

And though all strength still comes from Heaven,
  All light from God above,
Yet we may sometimes be his angels,
  The apostles of his love.

Then let us learn to help each other,
  Hoping unto the end: —
Who sees in every man a brother,
  Shall find in each a friend. S. L.

II. RETRANSLATION.

Reading lately a translation by Freiligrath, the popular young poet of Germany, of a beautiful song of Burns, written as a farewell Dirge to his native land, as he was about to embark for Jamaica, and remembering but the first three words of the original, I took a curious interest in translating it back, by way of *proving* it, as the boys do their sums in arithmetic, and the result was as follows.

How fast the gloomy night comes down!
The tempest howls; the storm-clouds frown,
As, big and black with rain, they stand
Above this naked, hilly land.

The moorland hunter homeward hies;
Beneath the hedge the partridge flies;
And I, oppressed with grief and care,
Gae, lonesome, by the banks of Ayr.

His ripening corn old Autumn wails,
So early shook by wintry gales;
He sees the storm in evening skies,
And wildly moaning, southward flies.
Cold in my bosom grows the blood,
When musing on the troubled flood,
Whose waves so soon my bark must bear
Far, far from you, sweet banks of Ayr!

'Tis not the surf that beats the land,
So wild and stern, nor yet yon strand,
With spars of many a wreck o'erspread,
Nor the chill storm-wind, fills with dread
The son of sorrow;— but my heart,
Must it not feel the cruel smart,
And beat fu' fast, and bleed fu' sair,
To break its chains, and leave thee, Ayr?

Fareweel, ye cairns, and hou's, and lakes,
Ye heathy hills, and glens, and brakes!
Thou silent path, thou valley green,
That oft my pangs of love have seen!—
Friend! foe! farewell! Alike be blest!
My love, my peace upon you rest!
But ah! this rush of tears tells mair
Than words can speak! farewell, my Ayr!

This was done purely as a translation, without any recollection of the original English, and some of your readers may be curious enough to compare the piece thus brought round through the German, with what it was in its original state. I would remark that the only thing which makes it impossible for the Germans to give the characteristic beauties of Burns is, that they have no dialect which bears the same relation to a German ear, that the Scottish does to an English ear, unless a sprinkling of Tyrolese might serve. "Bonny Doon" and "My jo, John" cannot be translated into German. C. T. B.

III. LIFE.

I would not live always in bondage to fear,
Where joy has divided dominion with sorrow,
Where smiles, as they rise, are oft checked by a tear,
And suns, shining brightly, breed clouds for the morrow.

Where pleasure seduces, adversity tries,
And reason and passion alternately sway,
Where doubt jostles faith as she struggles to rise,
And follows her footsteps as night follows day.

Where nothing can satisfy, nothing secure
From change and decay and disorder and strife,
No beauty is perfect, no virtue is pure,
And evil and good are companions for life.

Where finding no rest, like the patriarch's dove,
Which flew to the ark when the flood was abroad,
O'erwearied we seek in the mansions above
The rest that remains for the people of God.

Oh there would I dwell above life's stormy ocean,
Delivered from fear and temptation and sorrow,
There nothing disturbs the calm flow of devotion,
The sky has no clouds and the day no to-morrow.

But hush! 'tis more manly to strive than repine,
A resolute spirit brings good out of ill,
And though the ore's rough which we have to refine,
It yields a rich treasure to patience and skill.

The heat of the furnace turns iron to steel,
The fruit of long training is vigor and grace,
And virtue is noblest when stamped with the seal
Of sufferings that perfect, and struggles that brace.

Then murmur no more at the evils of life,
But use them as helpers its true good to win, —
The good that goes with us where sorrow and strife
And sin and uncertainty enter not in.

We toil up a steep, but it leads to the skies;
'Tis rough, but its roughness assists us to climb;
The labor is great, but far greater the prize, —
Eternity's joys for the trials of time. E. W.

ART. V. — BLANCO WHITE — RATIONALISM.*

MR. THOM has given to the world the autobiography of his friend Mr. White, with a modesty about the most remarkable that we remember to have seen in any biographer, or editor of biography. A beautiful Introduction of ten pages excepted, he has not inserted, in three volumes, three pages of his own writing. Only when the pen dropped from the invalid's hand, does he take it up to add a record of the last hours. He appears, only to close the eyes of his friend in death, and then retires. From what he has said and can so well say, we could wish that he had said more. We cannot help saying in fact that the Editor, with his opinions, must have been tempted to annotate and explain, to qualify and sometimes to disclaim; but he has done nothing of the sort. And certainly Blanco White had fairly earned the right to speak for himself. Our business is with the Memoirs, and we take leave of the Editor, simply commending the fidelity, dignity and calmness with which he has committed to the judgment and verdict of reflecting men, a book of no little import and likely to excite no little interest.

In speaking of Mr. White — commonly known as Blanco White, and author of Doblado's Letters — we must distinguish between his character and his opinions. With the latter we do not agree; but for the former we have the highest veneration and regard; nay, we will confess it, an affectionate and tender feeling. In his revolt against prevailing opinions he was a better man than most men are in their conformity. He was a better man, we believe, than many are who stand, in their sects, as bright and shining

* *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, written by Himself, with portions of his Correspondence.* Edited by JOHN HAMILTON THOM. In 3 vols. London. 1845.

Christians. He was a man of a most affectionate nature, and of an unconquerable love of truth. No man ever loved good men more, or ever loved truth more. These tendencies coming into conflict, made the bitter struggle of his life. In this struggle, in many pains and sicknesses and sorrows, he bore himself nobly. We do feel a little demurring, we confess, on one point. He did say hard things of Church and Clergy. We are sometimes pained by his language. But we believe that the high-minded and generous in the Church and Priesthood will be able to see, that these outbreaks upon them arose from circumstances, and not from bad impulses. Nay, they *may* be high-minded enough to acknowledge, that among the provocations are some serious faults of their own. Let them call these outbreaks, if they please, "the infirmities of a noble mind." It *was* a noble mind. This *was* a good man. We freely pay him this homage. We render to him that charity, justice and true regard which his affectionate spirit demanded.

But with this good and noble-minded Blanco White must we agree in all his opinions? He would as little have asked, as he conceded anything of this nature. In the course of his life, he passed from the extreme of Romanism to the extreme of Rationalism. He died believing in God, but without any belief in a future life. Had he lived long enough, we believe that, but for his affectionate nature, he would have arrived at the extreme of German Pantheism.

From this double view of his character and opinions, some may regret that this book was ever published. We do not. We welcome it on this very account. We have no fear for truth, but we have much for charity. This book is a powerful appeal to Christian candor. It may do something to soften that cruel and unchristian rancor against unbelievers, which, we deem, is one of the greatest wrongs that is done in Christendom. It shows that there may be good and devout men under the greatest diversities of honest conviction. Our charity, we freely say, goes fully to this length. We do not believe that the all-wise and perfect God has made the happiness, present or future, of imperfect and erring minds to depend upon the accuracy or correctness of their conclusions.

In the processes of mind through which he passed, Mr. White conceived himself to have reached the very foundations of religion and the only tenable faith in it. We propose then to inquire, with reference to his speculations, into the grounds of our great religious beliefs; that is to say, of our belief in God and of our belief in Christianity.

In the first place, what is the foundation of our belief in God? Why is it, or how is it, that we come to entertain this great conviction? What is it that justifies us in this belief that there is a God?

We say then, that this belief is a matter neither of intuition nor of revelation. Revelation presupposes it. It could not have spoken to man of God, unless it had found in his mind some idea of God and some faith in him. Neither is our conviction that there is a God, intuitive. It is a faith, not an intuition. "My certainty that I exist," says Baxter, "is greater than my certainty that there is a God." This is true as to the meaning, though the language is not exact. For the second is not a certainty. If it were, Baxter could not have doubted, as he did at some moments on his death-bed, whether there is a God. We are certain that *we exist*. We cannot doubt the essential distinction that exists in our minds between the true and the false, between right and wrong. These are intuitions. Again; the field of intuition is the field of consciousness — or of what consciousness necessarily implies, — and does not extend beyond it. We are conscious of what passes within us, and of nothing more. We are conscious of our own being, but not of God's being. We *believe* in God; in popular language we may say, we know that he exists; our assurance on this point rises to the highest degree of which moral demonstration is capable; but in strict philosophical accuracy we cannot say that by intuition we know it. If we could, books would not have been written to prove it. None were ever written to demonstrate to us that we exist. The being of God is not given to our passive nature or consciousness as an inevitable, intuitive truth. Man, uneducated, uninfluenced, unreasoning, would not have arrived at this great conviction. Some indeed deny it. Many actually escape all real impression of it. The notion of a Supreme Power, which comes only in the form of an occasional fear, which seldom or never goes so

far as to be a reverent contemplation, thanksgiving or prayer, can hardly be called so much as a faith. In deep and meditative devotion there dwells a knowledge of God, of which worldly indifference can scarce conceive. What we say is, that this great truth waxes and wanes in the mind, as the truths of intuition and consciousness never do.

But further; our consciousness necessarily *implies* some things. What is the extent of this implication? Does it go to the length of teaching us that there is a God? We think it does not. Let us consider to what it amounts. First, the action of our own mind of which we are conscious, the action of our will especially, meets with resistance. We believe then that something resists. We believe in the existence of something beside ourselves. The *me* implies the *not me*. But that something is not thus revealed to us as intelligent. It is the rock that we cannot lift, or the tree that we cannot uproot. Secondly, certain ideas in us imply certain other *ideas* as correlative to them. The knowledge of limited space implies the idea of infinitude; the conception of time, of eternity; the feeling of conscience implies the idea of an Infinite Conscience. We say, the idea. The actual existence of the objects for which these ideas stand is *not* implied. We have an idea of God; the question is, how do we arrive at the conviction that this idea stands for a reality? What is the proof of the Divine personality?

Now here it is, that we welcome as the only help, the teaching of nature, of a world of design — of a universe, in other words, full of the expression of mind. In a certain school of thinkers it is the fashion now-a-days to mock at this argument from nature. Mr. White says, "Let men talk of Physico-Theologies, and Demonstrations of the Existence and Personality of God, as they please; to me the only satisfactory, soul-filling proof of that sublime truth is the human mind. * * * Without the labor of any logical deduction, we feel fully convinced that supreme Love and Wisdom lead, though mysteriously, the mighty, but changeful concerns of this world."* But if there are "proofs" either from the mind or from nature, are they not "logical deductions?" If a man is "fully convinced"

* Vol. ii. p. 345.

of anything, it must be of something that he did not originally *know*, and it ought to be from some good, that is, logical, not fanciful, reasons. The language on this point, scattered through the autobiography, is desultory and somewhat vague; and it is not very easy to determine what is the ground taken. In one place the writer says, "I am persuaded that the study of nature, *by itself*, does not lead to the acknowledgment of the Deity: but I am on the other hand convinced, that this study, assisted by the light of that Rationality of which the simple, yet sublime principles are most easily developed in man, will certainly lead to God."* This, we conceive, is the true ground. But afterwards, when he had read more perhaps of the German philosophy, he seems to refer all to consciousness. "It is a vain attempt," he says, "to seek for knowledge of the Deity anywhere but within ourselves. * * * Useless or worse than useless are all the arguments of Natural Theology, unless we have previously found the proof of the being of God in our own souls." And what is this proof? "The limited," he answers, "proves the unlimited: else what could have set the limits?"† We cannot feel the force of this argument, for the purpose intended. The limited proves the unlimited; or more exactly to state the fact as it is in our minds, — the idea of the limited necessarily brings with it the idea of the unlimited; but that there is an unlimited *Being*, it does not imply nor prove. It gives us the idea of God, but not the proof of his existence. This is what we still seek.

And here it is, we repeat, that nature comes to our help. It speaks the very word that we wanted to hear. We cannot understand the scorn of this argument from nature; an argument as old as the world; which has helped to convince millions; and which is stated in holy Writ, where it is said that "the invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made, even his eternal power and Godhead;" so that atheists "are without excuse."‡ We should like to state this argument in the old Socratic form; as thus: —

Socrates. — Is not thought, by definition or by necessary conviction, the attribute of a thinker, of a conscious being?

* Vol. iii. pp. 10, 11. † Vol. iii. pp. 147, 8. ‡ Rom. i, 20.

Answer. — Apparently it is.

S. — Can there be design without a designer? Can you be witness to anything that shows design, without feeling that there is a designer?

Ans. — It would seem not.

S. — These ideas then of design and designer are correlative, coexistent, and mutually compulsory, are they not?

Ans. — I cannot deny it.

S. — Is there not design in nature; that is, an adjustment of part to part with a view to certain results? Is not the design as much a matter of fact as the rain, the shrub, the animal that displays it?

Ans. — Certainly it is.

S. — Suppose that you were the only being that you knew to exist in the world, and suppose that you could read, and suppose that you had found one day a book by the way-side; suppose that you had taken it up and read it; that you had found thoughts expressed in it, reasonings, points stated to be proved, and a chain of arguments to establish them; would you not say without any reasonable doubt, that somebody wrote it? Would you not be sure that there was some being, some thinking and conscious being in the world, beside yourself?

Ans. — The conclusion would be irresistible.

S. — Now look at the million-leaved book of nature; turn over leaf after leaf in this wonderful volume; see thought, design, wisdom, benevolence expressed on every page — as clearly to be seen, as much a matter of fact, as the page itself; and tell me if these do not reveal a Being, infinitely intelligent, wise and good?

Ans. — I cannot resist the conclusion; I receive it with joy.

But, says Mr. White, "whoever conceives of God's universe as the result of *contrivance*, has the image of a Man for his God; he is a mental idolater. It is true that we cannot conceive of what appears to us a complicated result, but as the result of contrivance; yet to transfer this our mental law of conception to the nature of God himself, is to deny his Godhead. Contrivance implies resistance, and limited as well as gradually exerted power; such ideas are contradictory of God." * * * This, he says, "is Anthropomorphism." *

* Vol. iii. p. 148.

St. Paul found an altar in Athens, dedicated to the "Unknown God." If we may not regard intelligence, wisdom and goodness in God as conforming in any respect or degree to our "mental conception" of those qualities, such an altar might well be erected for *our* worship. "Contrivance," it is true, is a low word to apply to the Supreme Being, and in fact, all the difficulty lies in the word; in human hands it "implies resistance, and limited as well as gradually exerted power;" but a perception of the *relations of parts with a view to the end* — so that in the human frame, for instance, muscle should not occupy the place of bone nor bone of muscle, which would be fatal to the end — this we must ascribe to the Divine Mind. *All* the words by which are set forth our idea of God — conception, design, wisdom, goodness, nay, Mind, Being itself, — must be derived from our own experience; which is only saying that our ideas must be human ideas; and here, doubtless, is a danger to be guarded against. But does a man escape this danger of anthropomorphism by drawing his ideas of God from his own bosom? Is not his deepest and most spiritualized thought, still a human thought? Nay, we conceive that there is less danger in letting the majesty and beauty of nature minister help to us, than in consulting our own mind to the exclusion of it. There may be a *spiritual Fetichism*, as well as one more gross and material. And although a mind like Blanco White's, with its elevated habits of thought, may be comparatively safe, while looking within alone; what would not be the peril of spiritual vanity or fanaticism, idolizing its own beautiful nature, and making "God altogether such an one as itself?" And we do say moreover, that we are allowed and obliged to attribute to God an intelligence like our own. There are contrivances in nature precisely like some of those which man has devised. The perception of relations in such a case must be the same. And again, our idea of the Divine goodness we draw and must draw from our own experience of goodness. If we deny all this, rational religion is impossible.

Such denial leads directly and inevitably to Pantheism. There is a difference, we need not say, between Divine and human intelligence and goodness, the difference between the Infinite and the finite: but it is a difference in

degree, not in essential nature. The Pantheist contemplates the difference, widens it, till he gives up the personality of the Supreme Being. To him God is no longer a Being. There is a dreamy state of mind, which we comprehend, for we have felt it, in which such a conclusion is possible. The man walks forth in some fair and still autumn day, with eyes half closed perhaps, with mind half lost in vague contemplation; his old habitual beliefs sink out of sight; a maze of reverie wraps him about like slumber; the curtains of old, familiar nature are drawn aside; he is in a new world; it is the fresh world perhaps of his unreasoning childhood, and he imagines that it is the world of truth, the world of true revelations. In this state of mind he falls into vast and undefined meditations. He questions anew the mystery of the world. What *is* all this around him, and whence came it? Fair and lovely things; music of a thousand chords, mysterious undertones from earth and waters; beautiful forms and colors waving in the breeze; the wide-embracing air; the golden sun; "the brave o'erhanging canopy;" incarnate Beauty! immanent Wisdom! no more! In his ravished sense is buried the keener thought that might penetrate through all to an Intelligent Cause. But who are these that walk amidst the splendor and beauty of this wonder-inspiring scene? — for they perhaps might recall him to some more definite thoughts of the Creator. No, "he sees men as trees walking." They are mere phenomenal shadows. Like flocks of birds they have come upon this summer shore, soon to fly away and to be found no more forever. These human generations — like waves they sweep on, and chafe and dash awhile in useless collision, and then sink away into the great sea of being.

This is Pantheism; dreamy, inane, gloomy Pantheism. And the remedy, we hold, is to be found in some vigorous and patient thinking. God is not revealed in dreams. He is not truly found, but by those who seek him. His being is not revealed to passive intuition, but to humble prayer for light. The Pantheist, we conceive, does not fairly read the book of teaching, whose page is spread before him. He does not open leaf after leaf and carefully peruse what is written thereon — intelligence, design, goodness. He could not look through a library of scientific descriptions without feeling that somebody wrote it. And what are

these books of science but rescripts from the infinite volume of nature?

Such then is the ground of our belief in a Supreme Being; first, the necessary *idea* of God in our own minds; secondly, the verification of that idea in the surrounding creation. We may add that an indubitable miracle would be a farther and still more striking verification. And believing that there have been true miracles in the world amidst many false, that there has been the reality amidst many counterfeits, we believe that such miracles have powerfully sustained among mankind the faith in God.

But we will now proceed, in the next place, to consider this subject of miracles, and especially of Christianity as a miracle-sanctioned communication from Heaven. We wish to state with some care what we regard as the true object of a miracle, and then to defend the view we take of it.

The object of miracles, then, is *not* to supersede natural religion. They build upon it. They could obtain no credence without it. If we did not first believe in God, in his rectitude and in the proofs which universal nature gives of his wisdom and goodness, a miracle would have no value with us whatever. This seems too plain a proposition to be stated. But it is constantly implied by the opposers of miracles, that we overlook the majesty and beauty of nature, that we undervalue its sublime teachings. We are told that the *creation* is filled with miracles of wisdom and love. Only excepting to the inaccurate use of the word "miracles" — which we confess seems to us very strange in a theological discussion — we heartily agree with this statement and have no desire to weaken it. Nature and natural religion are none the less interesting to us for our belief in miracles. Neither are the *laws* of nature undervalued by this belief. It is said that there is in the human mind a weak craving for miracles; and it is secretly felt that it is a kind of weakness to believe in them; that believing in them is to take part with the weak and unreflecting.

"The natural tendency of the uncultivated mind," says Mr. White, "is to limit and individualize the Deity. Man wants a God like himself — like the individual to whom the child runs for help, or before whom it cries in fear and terror, trying to

avert violence. * * * God must appear to do, expressly for the enthusiast, some individual thing he wants at that moment. This spirit of *singularity* produces that remarkable aversion to the visible universe, which is found inseparable from the enthusiastic piety prevalent among Christians. The heavens declare the glory of God in vain for them. They stop their ears against the accurate and faithful interpreter of that heavenly voice, Science, which they abhor, because it shows the regularity of the universe." *

Something worthy of attention there is in this statement, we admit, though we conceive that it is quite too unqualified. Such a tendency there is, to be guarded against. Fanaticism is always running to excess and error. We would know *what* truth or principle of religion has not been thus abused. Certainly we cannot see that we ought to be or are less interested in the order of nature for our belief in the Christian miracles. Rather do they react upon nature to make it more interesting, because they especially manifest God's paternal interest in his creatures. Did the cultivated Heathen lend a more devout or delighted ear to the teachings of nature, than have cultivated Christians? Has the Pagan literature shown more of this, than the Christian literature? We think not. And science, the study of nature, certainly has flourished most under Christian auspices; that is, under the faith of miracles — for such in all time has been the faith of Christians.

Again, with regard to the place which miracles hold in Christianity, we say that their object is not to authenticate a book, nor to vouch for the inspiration of any book, nor to assist any man's logical faculties, nor to produce in theological disquisitions a certainty unattainable by any other means; but simply to sanction a Divine mission, the mission of Christ. To this purpose they *are* appropriate, and to the others they have no pertinency whatever.†

This distinction, had it been attended to, might have spared us many useless questions. Can a miracle be necessary to teach us the simple principles of virtue and piety; that we ought to be good and kind, reverent and pure? Can the miracles prove that we have the very words of the original Christian record without change or interpolation; or that those very words, if we have them, are free from

* Vol. ii. pp. 152, 3. † Vol. iii. pp. 133, 4, and 145.

every possibility of mistake; or that the Apostles were inspired — we do not say commissioned, but inspired; or that any human words or human conceptions are infallible — a thing by definition impossible; or that certainty attaches in any way to any theological system? Such questions are scattered up and down through the autobiography of Mr. White; and to all these questions we answer, no. If any of these things are to be proved, they are to be proved by other means than miracles. To say that they do not establish any of these points, is to say nothing against their validity and importance.

Upon their irrelevancy to these purposes, we do not know that it is necessary to say another word: yet we would make this point clear. Suppose then the miracles to have been wrought. Does it follow that Matthew wrote the Gospel that bears his name, or that he was utterly incapable of mistake in giving his testimony? Was any miracle ever wrought to prove the Apostolic infallibility? It had been unhappy, if this were alleged; because there are unquestionable discrepancies in their statements; discrepancies which are actually of the highest value, because they prove that the testimony was artless, sincere and without conspiracy. And how strange were the pretension in miracles to teach us the first truths in religion — truths to which they appeal; or to establish in us a certainty upon all points in theology — a certainty of which we are incapable? And yet because miracles do not set upon the New Testament the seal of absolute originality or of absolute infallibility, it is argued that they are of little importance. What need of miracles? — it is said. What good do they do?

To this question our answer is, as before, that they authenticate a mission from Heaven; and that they are the only means by which such a purpose can be accomplished. Do not let it be loosely said in reply, that every man, or that every great and good man has a mission. We mean something other than this. Is what we mean unintelligible? Is it not conceivable, that in a dark, sensual and skeptical age it might please God to give a manifestation of himself beyond the teachings of nature and of natural reason; that he might interpose for the help of that age, and of all ages after it? Or suppose that now, amidst the per-

ils of modern freedom, the strugglings of the nations, the distractions of sects and parties, it should please the Governor of the world to make some new demonstration to bring the world into order and to bind it into unity, some demonstration beyond all the teachings of ordinary life and all the powers of ordinary human thought and action. Suppose that he would speak to mankind anew, and make them know that it was He that spoke. That utterance in some form or other would, by *definition*, be a miracle. There is no other conceivable method by which he could so speak.

But it may be said, that the mission of Christ authenticates itself, that it wants no sanction but the majesty and loveliness of his character, that a miracle can surround it with no new glory or beauty; and therefore that the alleged interposition is entirely unnecessary, useless and uninteresting. We will not say now that his own character is a miracle. Suppose it to be the natural result of his circumstances, or the unaided product of humanity. Suppose it to be only that which the lowest rationalist or skeptic grants. Yet if upon that transcendent and sacred virtue, that which won the love of God and men, it should have pleased God to set his seal, and to say with miraculous voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, hear him!" is it possible for any human mind to regard this as an event of no interest?

We wish to draw attention to the bare miraculous fact. We wish to separate from it everything that does not belong to it. We could look upon it in a still more isolated character — separated from the commonly supposed teaching, mission, messenger. But even so doing, we cannot understand the indifference, not to say scorn, with which some persons in these days seem to regard it. A sign from God! — a mark drawn by the finger of the Almighty upon the great tablet of the world! — the hand that moves all things stretched out and pointing to its own wonderful work! — a voice amidst the silence of the ages! — a word from the infinite Parent, reassuring his dark and erring child! — the faculties of our very nature must perish, the strugglings and sorrowings of our very heart must be still and dead, before we can be indifferent to such a manifestation as this. We have meditated upon God — in the bright morning, in the dark night-watches; the thought of

Him, we had almost said, haunts us — certainly it pursues, it meets us everywhere; it is the one great thought necessary to harmonize and bind all in order and unity; we have striven to pierce the material veil that often seems to hide Him — revealings there are too, but hidings also of his presence; we have studied the solemn story of the world, and dark shadows have been about us, deep and insoluble questions have arisen within us; we have sunk into the depths of our own nature, and have felt the awfulness and mystery of our being; and our thought has been — *could one word be spoken to us*, and that word, FATHER, Guardian of life and Giver of immortality — no light so welcome ever visited any poor prisoner of sorrow and hope! Whether that word has been spoken is not the question now; but we say, if that word has been spoken, if there is satisfactory evidence that it has been spoken, *that* man denies his own nature, who says that it is indifferent to him; and that man who scorns it, mocks at the majesty and sorrow and need of his own soul!

But has such an event ever taken place in the world? And is the New Testament a true record, to the extent of furnishing valid testimony of such a fact? We say, to this extent; for the competency of the testimony is no more affected by the minor discrepancies and difficulties that attend it, than is the testimony which establishes a fact, with similar circumstantial abatements, in a court of justice. It is not necessary that the testimony, to be sufficient, be inspired or infallible. It would not be testimony if it were, but authoritative declaration. It would not be witnesses that speak, but the judge. But the Apostles call themselves "witnesses." If it has pleased God to cast into the bosom of the world the great fact of miracle, it does not follow that he must have surrounded it with an unerring guardianship. The truth of his own being, the revelation of nature, he has not so guarded; why should he have protected the revelation of miracle against every possibility of doubt? The opposers of miracles complain that we make too much of them; but it seems to us that it is they who make too much of them, by demanding that they be surrounded with an almost miraculous barrier of evidence. Such evidence would not be consonant with the general laws of moral influence. It would not be possible, perhaps,

in the nature of things. We question whether the objector, if he were to devise his own scheme or species of proof, would find any stronger than the testimony on which we rely. If a miracle is possible; if it is credible that it may have been wrought for purposes as important as the sanction and spread of Christianity; and if the evidence is the strongest conceivable — the strongest *moral*, not miraculous evidence (which would nullify itself); what more can be demanded?

We are not going into this evidence in detail, but we wish to submit in regard to it one or two remarks.

The date of the testimony is ancient, the time is long ago; the difficulty incident to the case, is to bring the witnesses into our presence. Now we are led back by an unbroken chain of connexion from age to age, from Church to Church, to a very early period. Dr. Strauss himself admits that the Gospels were written before the destruction of Jerusalem; that is, within about thirty years after the death of Christ. And he frames the strange and self-refuting theory, that the story of Jesus is a Messianic myth; that is to say, that this story took its origin and form in Jewish expectations of the Messiah — expectations every one of which was utterly disappointed by the life of Jesus! It would be very much as if our Washington had crushed his nation's hope by becoming a traitor to its darling project of emancipation from a foreign yoke, and then that immediately after his death there had gone forth, uncontradicted, from the bosom of American rage and despair a glorifying history of this very Washington. But to return; if Matthew and Mark and John did not write the narratives which bear their names, we must suppose that certain impostors, during their very life-time or immediately after, dared to assume their name and authority and to forge certain legends as their writing; and that these legends were received as theirs, by reverent disciples, concerning the Master whom they almost adored. 'Ah! it was an ancient time,' is the thought of some: and the moment they begin to talk about antiquity and tradition, and myths and legends, their imagination falls into a sympathizing dreaminess. But let us take off from that age this cloud of obscurity. It was *a time in the world*, as well as this in which we live. Men in that time were substantially what

they are now. We know that age very well. It was, not in character but in position, the high and luminous period of antiquity. We know especially that the Christian religion excited in multitudes the profoundest interest. The world had never before received such an impulse. Men were wide awake, not sleeping in Oriental bowers. And the things connected with Christ and the spread of the Christian religion "were not done in a corner." The Christian communities were full of veneration for the Apostles, and filled too with their *preached accounts* of the life of the Master. Now to suppose that under the very shadow and sound of their pulpits, certain forgers could have palmed off upon these watchful and steadfast churches a collection of lying legends, a certain false story of Jesus filled with miracles of which they had never heard a word from the Apostles, that they could have induced the churches to receive these new and before unheard of stories as the Apostles' own authentic writing; this — to say nothing of the internal evidence to the contrary — is a thing, if not utterly incredible, at least far more incredible than our Christian claim.

The witnesses, then, we conceive, are fairly before us. And now let us make an analogous supposition. Let us suppose that in the State of Massachusetts — a tract of territory about as large as Palestine — twelve men, twelve such men as the Apostles, with the same truth, sincerity and moral elevation that we inevitably ascribe to them, should solemnly testify to certain miraculous facts, as connected with a life of extraordinary virtue and sanctity, and that life and its teaching, one of most especial pertinence to the moral reform of the present age; suppose that the facts were open, public, manifest, — the instant healing of many sick, the raising from death, the resurrection of the Master himself; suppose that these twelve men, as sane and true men, to say the least, as any that you know and honor, stood around these facts, looked at them from every side, and undoubtingly believed in them, and sealed that faith with their blood; and the question is — does this mass of evidence demand rejection or assent? *We* solemnly believe that rejection of it would be unjust and unphilosophical. We are persuaded that if twelve of the wisest and best men that we know, should bring to us such united

testimony, we should believe in what they averred, and should find it almost impossible to disbelieve it. Bring home the matter of this evidence, we say; and let it not be dissipated into imaginary mists of antiquity. Name the men, twelve, the wisest and purest men you know; and then suppose them solemnly and constantly to aver, for instance, that their Master who was crucified and laid in the grave had risen from the dead, that for forty days afterwards they had been in constant intercourse with him; and we say that belief in such a testimony would naturally, and would entirely, preponderate over doubt.

Why then is doubt springing up in an unusual manner at the present moment? Why is it setting aside a weight of evidence which has satisfied ages; nay, and has convinced a multitude of the greatest men, the wisest and most discriminating thinkers in the world? Let us bestow a little attention upon this problem.

In the first place, by the very reaction of opinions we have fallen upon an age of unbelief. From believing everything, we have come to doubt everything; and the one position is as unreasonable and false as the other. It is not miracle only that is, by the doubting party, rejected. The free political tendency is leading many too much to cast off all authority and precedent, the free social tendency, to question all former social organizations, the philosophic, to sweep away all the received principles of experience and common sense; and in like manner, the religious tendency of a class of minds is, to reject all miracles, all beliefs, all authority but that of bare intuition.

In the next place, there is not only a habit of doubting, but there is a kind of quixotism with regard to doubt, which is worthy of some special notice. Doubt is looming up in the regions of mist and imagination, while belief is clothed only with the armor of reason; and the contest seems very unequal and unfair. We are persuaded that there are minds, under the influence of this tendency, with which a scruple of doubt weighs more than a pound of positive argument. With some, it is a morbid conscientiousness or jealousy, afraid of yielding too much to implicit or established faith; with others, it is a failure to distinguish the proper nature and limits of moral evidence. Thus when the argument for miracles is set forth and is made to appear

as it undeniably is, very strong; "Ah," says one, "but there is a doubt!" And he lays an emphasis on this word, *doubt*, as if it settled the question, and there was no more to be said about it: "There is a doubt then; you admit it," says the objector; as if this were a giving up of the case entirely; as if this vague and irresponsible doubt were to set aside a whole mass and mountain of evidence. This, we say, is a total misconception of the nature and province of moral argument. A man will not believe, because he has not certainty; as if he could be properly said to believe at all, if he had certainty.

It is a summary method, and therefore perhaps agreeable; but it is not that plan of patient inquiry which is God's dispensation to us. We are placed in this world to struggle with many moral and practical questions, and to believe and to act according to the strongest evidence. If we refuse to do this, we must stop in the course alike of thought and action. We do not say that the Christian miracles are indubitable; but we say that there is an immense and preponderating mass of evidence in their favor. The growth of a crop of wheat to maturity is not indubitable; but we find inducement enough to cultivate it without that certainty: that is to say, we act upon a strong probability. And thus do we rationally welcome whatever evidence there is for the Christian miracles, to strengthen the great spiritual beliefs and hopes of our nature. All our religion does not repose upon them; but it derives support from them, and we believe, that according to the laws of moral evidence, it is lawfully entitled and bound so to do.

But it may be said, that the solid difficulty lies in the very nature of a miracle. It is true, we suppose, that every thing, with the rejector of miracles, presses upon this point. If the facts in question lay in the field of ordinary history, a fortieth part of our Christian evidence would be sufficient to establish them. Now the reception or rejection of these facts depends a good deal, we believe, upon certain states of mind. In this comparison we leave out of the case all those whose belief is mere acquiescence, and not the result of any reasoning. We speak of thinkers. And we say that there is a state of mind which favors unbelief, and another which favors belief. The former is very intelligible. It is natural. It is the first thought. It is the careless

thought. We do not mean to speak of it with any opprobrium; it has been our own. But we do believe that there is a state of mind that comes from deeper meditation, and is more truly philosophical. To a mind so meditating, nature is not mere mechanism nor mere fixed order; but something instantly obedient to the movements of the Infinite Will. That this earth on which we live is a little world, or one of innumerable worlds, is a consideration, we believe, which, however it may strike our limited apprehension, is nothing to the Infinite Providence. We believe that God is a Being who watches over every world that he has made, with the minutest care and the most paternal kindness. We believe — such is his greatness — that his care over this world is the same as if it were the only world in existence; nay, that each human being, in his welfare and progress, is as truly regarded, as if he were the only being in the universe. "A sparrow falleth not on the ground without your Father; ye are of more value than many sparrows" — is to us the language of pure reason and reverent wisdom. Suppose then that this were the only world in the universe; man, the only created being. Would it be such an incredible thing that God should interpose for the guidance and welfare of this world, this race of beings — his only care? We are persuaded that it would not.

But again — to take a larger view — is it such a credible thing, that it is in fact the only thing credible, that God from eternity should have so established the laws of his creation, the order of sequences, that through all the coming eternity he must rigidly adhere to it, that he can never make any deviation, not from his wise and holy purposes, but from the visible order of events? This would seem more like a fate than a government. To say nothing of matter, *man* is possessed of a *will*, that is by its very nature capable of falling into great disorder. And we must suppose this to be true of all worlds of rational beings. Over this universe God reigns in wisdom and mercy. Is it such an incredible thing, that He should sometimes, in the course of ages, interpose for one world or for another, to rescue it from its disorders and guide it to happiness? Such is our view at least of the Infinite Being and of his moral creation, that we cannot deem this an incredible nor an irrational supposition.

And this same suspension of the laws of nature, the very idea of which seems to arrest some philosophers as if it were perfectly monstrous and absurd — is *this* such an incredible thing? Why, some law of nature is suspended at every instant.* Every step we take in our daily walk suspends the law of gravitation. The weight of our body, which gravitation would hold to the earth, is lifted from it at our will. But this, it will be said, is only the yielding of an inferior to a superior law, of matter to mind. So is a miracle. But still, it will be said, the analogy fails. The yielding of the gravitating force to our will presents a constant and familiar sequence; a miracle, to our experience, stands alone, a solitary fact. It is true; and yet, if our experience were larger, if our knowledge embraced the innumerable worlds, it might appear that interposition is as frequent with the Infinite Mind, as with us are the steps of our daily walk. But we will not insist upon this. We only say that nature is not an inviolable bond. The order of its sequences is interrupted by our will. *Why should it not be interrupted by the Infinite Will?* "Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?" Why is it any more incredible, why is it in fact any more miraculous, than the creation of the first man or than the creation of the world? A miracle suspends a particular law of nature; but it does not, for all that we can see, violate the laws of *being;* unless we mean to exclude from the sum of existence Him in whom all else lives and moves and has its being. Nature is not a venerable fixture that may not be touched. It is a ministration to the mind. It is obedient to the mind. The human will constantly interferes with its tendencies, changes the direction of its blind, impulsive forces. This *nature* a miracle interferes with — in this sense violates; but we repeat, *it does not violate the laws of being.*

The causes of unbelief which we have now been considering, we conceive were manifest and active in the mind of Blanco White. We think we see proofs of a powerful mental reaction that carried him too far. We speak with respect for his memory; but we state, and modestly state

* See an able tract on Mr. Hume's argument against miracles, by A. H. Lawrence; printed at Washington, D. C.

our simple conviction. Our solution of the problem of his mental life is this. He began with believing a great deal too much; under that influence he ended with believing a great deal too little. The victim of institution and authority in early life, he was naturally desirous of escaping the farthest possible from them. Conscientious, and jealous of implicit and groundless belief, he gave to doubt more than its due weight. He constantly reasons against the possibility of attaining to certainty with regard to the Christian facts and declarations, as if the proper alternative were to reject them. Indeed we cannot regard him as a very close and cogent reasoner. He deals more in assertions than in arguments. We do not feel that he has sounded the depths of this matter of miraculous interposition. We have his strong mental protests against many things; but we do not find them to be satisfactorily reasoned out. He will stir questions in the minds of his readers, but we do not believe that he will settle them. He was a sick man; his life in England was one long illness; and his invectives against authority, Church and Priesthood, often seem to us more querulous than philosophical. In the English Church they will call them mere ravings. We do not call them so; we do not say that they were groundless; but we think that they were, to a certain extent, indiscriminate and unjust.

We can admit much that Mr. White says of miracles without coming to his conclusion. With regard to the essential incredibility of miracles we are indeed at issue with him.* But when he says that plain, unlettered Christians could not have been put to decide upon matters of historical evidence on pain of perdition for any mistake, when he says that a belief in miracles cannot be essential to salvation, and in fine that certainty does not belong to subjects of this nature, we agree with him. But it does not follow from all this, that there is not good ground for believing in the miracles. Put inspiration and infallibility out of the question; let the Christian testimony stand upon the same ground as any other testimony; let it be as liable to mistake as any other; let it be admitted to have erred upon some points; and still we have evidence that satisfies

* See Vol. iii. p. 244, 5.

us of the truth, sincerity and substantial correctness of the Evangelical narrators.

We have said that in Mr. White's manner of speaking of the Church and its ministers, and of religious authority in general, there seems to us to be a want of discrimination and fairness. That a heavy bondage lies upon most Churches is doubtless true; that every Priesthood, every isolated body of men, is liable to have the spirit of a class, and to be illiberal and intolerant, no discerning man will deny; and we wish that these evils and perils had been so stated as to bespeak the serious attention they deserve. But these wholesale denunciations of all Churches and their Clergy, as full of pretension, craft and cruelty, though they may gratify a certain class of persons, will give pleasure, we believe, to no wise man. With regard to the use of authority, especially with children, we ask if it is not inevitable, if it is not the evident order of nature. Mr. Gallaudet — a man whose name we cannot pass without expressing for him the sincerest respect and esteem — is severely censured for a dogmatic teaching of children in his "Book of the Soul." But we ask, what could he teach them but that which he believed? We suppose, if Blanco White had instructed children, he would have inculcated a belief in God. But then comes the atheist and says, "This man is poisoning the minds of children with his Theism;" or the Pantheist and says, "This man, when speaking of the Supreme Power, says *He*, when he ought to say *It*."

Upon Mr. White's views of the New Testament teaching we must dwell a moment. He inveighs much against what he calls *bibliolatry*, the worship of the book. "Christianity," he says, "is not founded on a book." But we ask, how could it be known without a book; or without, what is tantamount, a testimony, a telling by somebody of what Jesus Christ said and did and was. The book, he says, "was not in existence when Christ left the world, nor did he predict that such a book was to be collected."* But what avails this? Christ did commission his disciples to teach and testify concerning him. If not a written testimony, then there must have been an oral testimony, preserved by tradition, to convey to us the requisite knowledge

* Vol. ii. p. 234.

of Jesus. Then the tradition would have been objected to, and with far more reason. With far greater justice would it have been said, "Christianity is not founded on a tradition." Upon what then would it have been founded? Upon nothing. The Christ would have been nothing but an abstraction of goodness, or the reflection of our ideas of goodness. We should have vaguely heard that some great and good being lived ages ago, and that is all. The written account of Socrates would have been far more valuable.

Mr. White contends that a definite revelation would stop the progress of knowledge.* But let us distinguish. A definite creed, a definite system of Physics, would be such a bar. For such a view of the New Testament we are not responsible. But could not the world be taught a clearer knowledge of God and of a future life, and could not a divine ideal and pledge of God's goodness and mercy be presented in Jesus Christ, the highest ideal of humanity, the highest proof of the divine pity, without any hindrance to progress? Have not these teachings, received with reverence, received as authoritative, been the very means of progress?

But Mr. White goes farther, and calls in question the very ideal and teaching of the Master. He says,† "Christ and his Apostles thought, that to give away everything a man possessed, was one of the highest acts of virtue." "The first Christians unquestionably attempted something like a community of goods; at all events, the selling of property to put the amount into the common fund was believed to be a very virtuous deed. Such is the meaning of the remonstrance of Peter to Ananias." *Was* it not a very virtuous deed of the early Christians, thus generously to contribute to the relief of their persecuted and suffering brethren? On the very next page he says, concerning Christ's searching command to the young man, to sell all and give to the poor, and to come and follow him,‡ that "the recommendation had most reasonable grounds in the circumstances of the times." This is the true answer; but with this answer in his mind, we cannot conceive why he made the objection. What Peter says to Ananias

* Vol. iii. p. 253. † Vol. ii. p. 200. ‡ Matthew xix. 21.

shows that the large charity recommended was not of an absolute or universal obligation. "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hath Satan filled thine heart, to lie to the Holy Ghost and to keep back part of the price?" The sin, in fact, consisted not in refusing to give, but in an attempt at deception in the very presence of God.

Upon the text, "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," * and others like it, Mr. White comments as the source of many errors, — monachism, bodily marceration, and an irrational contempt of the body. Is the Apostle's doctrine answerable for the abuse of it? We have certainly been sometimes reminded in reading St. Paul, of the criticism, that his mind on this subject was tinged with the philosophy of his time. But yet our observation has convinced us that his representation is substantially true. The body, fair palace of the soul though it be, a goodly house of instruction and discipline, is yet darkened by many vails, is infested by temptations, and is often felt by us to be an obstruction, a clog and a prison. By disease, and yet more by vice, it is often made "a vile body." And on every account, we cannot think it unreasonable to rejoice that it shall yet be laid aside and exchanged for a more glorious form.

Christian humility and martyrdom, too, come under Mr. White's censure. Alas! we said as we went on with the Memoir, everything is to go down before this firm and determined criticism. Humility, he says, "is the virtue of slaves, and familiarity with the lash was the true preparation of the heroes of martyrdom." † This language of the old Pagan scorn sounds strangely enough in these modern days. But we would ask, if this is not a radical misconception of the Christian virtue of humility. We have always regarded it as a homage to God, rather than to men; as the lowly and contrite bowing down of a sinful creature before his Maker. But call the virtue in question meekness, patience, patient endurance, rather than fierce retaliation of wrong; and then the same question arises. When we first read the New Testament with any interest,

* Philipians iii. 21. † Vol. iii. pp. 272, 3.

we remember that queries of this nature were continually arising in our minds about the essential virtues of Christianity; it was the *first* painful questioning we had about the Christian religion. But we did come to the conclusion, after two years of such reading, that it was our doubt, born of the Pagan (school) classics, that was wrong, and not Christianity: and we have still the same conviction. The ideal of Christian meekness seems to us, not a low, but a lofty one. It does not exclude indignation at wrong. But, while conscious of the wrong, to stand calm and patient and self-restrained under its infliction; to resist it doubtless at times, but never to retaliate; to wish no ill to the aggressor; to pity him amidst his utmost violence; to bless those who curse us, to do good to them who hate us, and to pray for them who despitefully use us and persecute us; — is this to be represented as a slavish meanness? And the patience, the prayer of Jesus on the cross — we shudder to ask the question — is that to fall before the same criticism? And the virtue of martyrdom, — to die rather than speak the false word — to die for principle, — the canonized virtue of all ages — is that the virtue of slaves?

We understand Mr. White, too, as objecting to prayer; that is, to prayer considered as direct petition.* He says that a "*desire* of conformity with the will of God" is constant with him, and that is his prayer. But we ask, not merely whether the Scriptures do not encourage and enjoin express petitions, but whether it is not the very language of nature, whether a man who believes in God can help sometimes saying, in pain and in peril of his soul, "God help me!" — and that is direct prayer. Observe what the unhappy sufferer whose experience we are considering, says in his own case. "Oh God!" he says, "thou knowest that I do not feel justified in directing particular petitions to thee. My heart is open before thee. Thou knowest the great affliction in which I am lingering." But now observe what follows. "My only request is for strength, patience, and love of thee. As an expression of my love, I also pray for my son, my relations, and all my good friends."† Are not these "particular petitions?"

* Vol. iii. p. 276.

† Vol. iii. p. 293.

Thus we believe that human nature will always contradict itself when it enters into speculative controversy with its own inevitable wants and irresistible tendencies.

At length this remarkable person, when approaching the end of his mortal pains and strifes, quits the last hold upon positive Christianity. The belief in a God alone remains to him. "He dies and gives no sign" of Christian hope. These are his words. "I have often confessed to thee, my God, my own more than indifference to that supposed continuation of life, in which people so loudly profess a belief. That thou art able to maintain my individual consciousness forever, I will not deny, though my imagination faints whenever I try to embody that conception."* "More than indifference" to a future life! — is not this the merest hallucination? Is it not an absolute intellectual insanity? When a man says to us, that he does not care to live hereafter, we would ask him this simple question: — If a peril approached your life, would you not strive to ward it off? If it were now proposed to you instantly to cease to be, would not the simple love of existence say, "No, let me live?" If then, at the present moment you would live the next moment, for the same reason in this life you would live another life.

But it is time to finish this, we fear, too extended review. We will only say, in conclusion, that we have no fear of the prevalence and spread, for a long time, of the opinions which we have been examining. This school of opinions must die. Its tendencies are suicidal. So long as humanity demands a faith, the system of no-faith cannot prevail. This philosophy, in fine, is the apotheosis of humanity, and we believe that humanity is too humble to accept it. The central thought of religion indeed is in the soul of man; but the circumference spreads to infinity, to eternity. Upon the radiating lines that run outward to those awful regions of the unknown and the illimitable, thoughts, affections, desires, live and tremble with undefined hope and fear. They ask some other guidance than their own. And in that system which tells us there is none, there can be no repose. There are needs of our nature which that system cannot supply, sorrows which it never can console,

* Vol. iii. p. 289.

and quenchless aspirations which it never can satisfy. If we must come to this, God pity us! "If in this life only we have hope," we are — despite of philosophy, despite of all the joys of life, despite of any fortitude that *we* can understand — we are of all beings, the most miserable.

We have only to add with regard to the autobiography of Blanco White, that we have examined it in this article with a particular view. We have thought it of the first importance to subject its Rationalistic tendencies to a careful review. But there is an entirely different direction of thought with regard to this work, which we could wish to see thoroughly followed out. The value of its protests against the popular forms of Christianity ought to be carefully appreciated; and we hope that some competent hand will undertake the task. O. D.

ART. VI. — SCHAF ON PROTESTANTISM.*

IT seems that a young German scholar from Berlin, by the name of Schaf, has just been appointed to one of the professorships in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church in Pennsylvania. We have before us his Inaugural Address, considerably enlarged, and an apologetic Introduction by his colleague, Dr. Nevin. Together they make a bulky pamphlet, but the whole is worth reading; as is also the Appendix, containing a sermon by Dr. Nevin on Catholic Unity. As regards the literary execution of the Address, the most remarkable thing is, that a discourse, delivered on a public occasion in this country, should need to be translated into English; but as it was necessary, we wish it had been translated into better English.

The object of Dr. Nevin in the Introduction is twofold; first, to reconcile the Orthodox in this country to the policy

---

* *The Principle of Protestantism as related to the Present State of the Church.* By PHILIP SCHAF, Ph. D. Professor of Church History and Bib. Lit. in the Theol. Sem. of the Ger. Ref. Church. Translated from the German with an Introduction. By JOHN W. NEVIN, D. D. Chambersburg, Pa. 1845. 12mo. pp. 215.

of introducing here a German teacher of theology; and secondly, to apologise for this teacher's German style of thought and expression. Dr. Nevin maintains that there are prevailing and characteristic defects in the Anglo-American as well as in the German mind, and that what is true and good in one might and should find its complement in what is true and good in the other. Though Orthodox himself, he contends earnestly for what he calls an "historical progress" in the religious life of the Church, and in Christian theology, and is sure that if Protestantism does not recognise this fact and govern itself accordingly, it cannot stand. On this point his words are:

"Taking the present state of Protestantism as ultimate and complete, we must despair of its being able to stand against its enemies. Our faith in its divine mission can be intelligent, only as we confidently trust that it will yet in due time surmount its own present position, and stand forth redeemed, and disenthralled from the evils that now oppress it, to complete the Reformation so auspiciously begun in the sixteenth century. The necessity of some such new order of things is coming to be more and more sensibly felt; and may we not trust, that the way for it is fast being prepared, though, to our narrow view, chaotically still and without light, in the ever deepening and extending agitation, with which men's minds are beginning to be moved, as it might seem all the world over, in this direction. The feeling that we are on the eve of some vast religious revolution, by which a new epoch shall be constituted in the development of the history of the Church as a whole, has taken strong possession of many of the first minds in Europe. And it is quite evident that in this country too, a sentiment of the same general sort is steadily gaining ground. Men feel that they have no right to be satisfied with the actual state of the Church, and they are not satisfied with it in fact." —p. 16.

Professor Schaf chose for the subject of his Inaugural Discourse, "The Principle of Protestantism, and its relation to the present posture of the Church, particularly in the United States." He endeavors to prove that the Reformation was one stage in the growth or historical progress of the Catholic Church, and that Romanism, or the so-called Catholic Church, by falling back from itself, has lost its title to Catholicity, which then passed over to the main body of the Protestant Churches. In common with many Continental writers, he holds that the essential principle of the Reformation was Luther's doctrine of justification by

faith alone, and that the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, were but incidental to it as Protestantism. He thinks that the two last mentioned principles have been pushed much farther than the authors of the Reformation intended; and hence Rationalism and Sectarism, which he stigmatizes as diseases or caricatures of Protestantism. Puseyism he regards as a reaction occasioned by these abuses, but not the remedy.

"Preposterous imagination! Can the Church be renovated by putting on a new coat? I have all respect for the Episcopal system. It possesses in fact many undeniable advantages, and by its antiquity besides must command the veneration of all who have any right historical feeling. But the thought must be utterly rejected, that it carries in its constitution as such the proper and only remedy for the existing wounds of Protestantism. Does it offer any sure guaranty for union? The contests with which the English Episcopal Church has been torn, especially for the last ten years, (to say nothing of the posture of our American Episcopacy at this moment,) sufficiently show the contrary. Or does it furnish more efficient means for the promotion of true inward piety? Let the state of the Greek Church, always true to the Episcopal succession, be taken in reply; or the Roman Church as it stood towards the close of the Middle age, and as it stands still in entire countries; or the Church of England itself, as it appeared under the last Stuarts and during the eighteenth century. No, we need something higher and better than anointed lords and consecrated gentlemen. Such aristocratic hierarchs and proud bearers of the apostolical succession precisely, like the pharisees and high priests of Judaism, have themselves again and again secularized the Church, rocking it into the sleep of lifeless formalism or religious indifference." —p. 126.

Professor Schaf turns with hope and confidence to the great reaction against Rationalism in his own country, which he dates from the first publication of Schleiermacher's "masterly Discourses upon Religion," in 1779. So shorn was this epoch of all religious life and consciousness, that Schleiermacher, he tells us, "found it necessary to start from the beginning; taking his stand as it were in the court of the Gentiles, to teach his Wolfian, Kantian and Philanthropistic contemporaries, the nature of religion first in general, that he might gain footing again for an intelligible representation of the Christian system." To a

portion of the followers of this eminent theologian, and also to those who constitute what is called the *right side* of the Hegelian school, he looks mainly for the learning and skill by which Protestantism is to be saved not only from Romanism, but from itself. It is because he thinks that these men possess and combine, in a preeminent degree, evangelical sentiments, a free scientific development, and a proper regard for tradition; which last he holds to be nothing else than that unbroken stream of Christian life and conscientiousness, which has rolled itself along in the Church from the beginning, and from which individual believers cannot cut themselves free, if they would, and ought not to do so, if they could. Taking this ground, the reader will not be surprised to find him sometimes at sharp issue with his Orthodox brethren in this country; as, for example, on the subject of German Transcendentalism.

"Speak as men may against German transcendentalism, as the word passes here in a wholesale way, this at least no one acquainted with the subject can deny; that at the very time when the most celebrated theologians cast away the cardinal evangelical doctrines of the incarnation and atonement, as antiquated superstitions, Schelling and Hegel stood forth in their defence, and claimed for them the character of the highest reason; and that while the reigning view saw in history only an aggregate of arbitrary opinions, a chaos of selfish passions, they taught the world to recognize in it the ever opening sense of eternal thoughts, an always advancing rational development of the idea of humanity and its relations to God. Such a view must gradually overthrow the abrupt revolutionary and negative spirit which characterized the last century, restoring respect for the Church and its history, and making room for the genuine power of the positive. It is true indeed, that one section of the Hegelian school, (the so called *left side*,) has produced the latest and most dangerous form of Rationalism, in which the doctrine of myths and pantheistic hero-worship are made to play so large a part. But this tendency is diametrically opposed to the historical, objective element, that clearly rules the spirit if not always the letter of the great philosopher's writings, and cannot be regarded therefore at all events as a complete application of his system to theology. And then again it must be considered that the movement in question is rendered so dangerous, just because it has received into itself, pantheistically caricatured to be sure, so many truths of Christianity, for which the old Rationalism had no organ whatever, and because it is conducted also

with so much more spirit and depth; which itself again is to be referred to a general advance, that may be easily remarked also in the form of the later theology as more scientific than before." —pp. 149—152.

In a note to this passage he grows warmer still, condemning, in no measured terms, an article by Professor Stowe, on "Teutonic Metaphysics or Modern Transcendentalism," which appeared in the Biblical Repository for January last. Thus he begins: —

"I am truly sorry to find myself disappointed in Dr. Stowe. In view only of his relations to my honored instructor and friend Dr. Dorner, now counsellor of consistory and professor of theology at Koenigsberg, I held him capable of understanding and appreciating the German philosophy and theology, much beyond what he has shown in this unfortunate article. It is not in my mind at all to undertake a wholesale defence of any system of German philosophy as such; for I prize too much the liberty of thought to be bound by any philosophical school, and yield my reason to be led only by the bible. But men like Kant, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, who have devoted their whole life to the most laborious and profound inquiries, and who beyond all question belong to the greatest names in the history of the world, should be treated in different style by such a man as Stowe, in justice only to his own character. Instead of saying a word to us on the contents of the later positive system of Schelling, he informs us of his controversy with Dr. Paulus of Heidelberg, which has nothing in the world to do with the matter in hand; and even takes the part of this wretched rationalist, who closed his career as a writer with a literary theft, against the great philosopher — not dreaming at all, as it would seem, that it is precisely the acknowledged merit of this last, to have overcome the standpoint of the abstract understanding, from which the old common Rationalism made war upon all the deeper truths of Christianity. For this 'common sense,' entitled as it is to all respect in its own sphere, the region of the simply finite, will always hold the doctrines of the trinity and incarnation for nonsense; since according to its shallow, empty way of reasoning, three cannot be one nor one three, God cannot be man nor man God. If then no higher principle be allowed to prevail in theology, it must be shorn of all its deeper import. Such a higher principle is the *reason*, by which we apprehend the supersensuous, the infinite, the divine. But it is Schelling precisely who has successfully asserted the supremacy of this principle in science. To be convinced of this, let Dr. Stowe read Schelling's Lectures on the Method of Academic Study, particularly the fifth and sixth. He will find there a most masterly and powerful argument

against the presumption of the mere understanding; in thrusting itself with its poor surface-skimming nature into the region of the higher sciences, which have to do with everlasting ideas — making all flat by trying to make all clear." — pp. 150, 151.

After this, we hope our Orthodox friends will remember who are rightfully to be suspected, on doctrinal grounds, of inclining to Transcendentalism. J. W.

Art. VII. — POETS AND POETRY OF EUROPE.*

The literature of translations has not received the attention which its importance deserves, either in France or in England. No nation is of itself sufficient for its own full intellectual development. Foreign modes of thought, the philosophy, history and poetical creations of those who live in other climes or lived in other ages, are indispensable means of counteracting that intense national bigotry, which, sometimes under the name of patriotism, sometimes under that of national pride, has been fostered and flattered by demagogues as something praiseworthy, until a general narrowness of mind and a stupid insensibility to excellence except within the limits and conditions of conventional taste have grown into characteristics of a whole people. Out of the entire number of readers, even among the educated classes, in any country, only a few are able to enjoy the works of foreign authors in the original languages. The din and pressure of daily life allow but little leisure, and perhaps less inclination for unravelling the intricacies of foreign idioms or solving the difficulties of grammatical constructions, or for studying those national peculiarities which control the forms of speech and give a peculiar coloring to the creations of literature.

The great means, then, of enlarging the intellectual sympathies of the public, and of freeing national taste from the bigotries of narrow literary creeds, is obviously translation. And it becomes a question of great interest and import-

* *The Poets and Poetry of Europe.* By Henry W. Longfellow. Philadelphia: Cary & Hart. 8vo. pp. 779.

ance, what are the principles of translation; for the work may be executed in different ways, with different ends, and so as to produce different effects. The old English rule required the translator to produce the given work in English, such as the author would have written it had he been an Englishman. There are several objections to the principle of this rule, the first and most material of which is the impossibility of carrying it into execution in any case whatever. The translator can only conjecture what his author's work would have been, had he written it in English; two translators will have different conjectures, and will reproduce the work under quite different forms. In short, they will produce two different works, agreeing, it is true, in the mere outline, and perhaps in the leading features, but differing in every other respect, according to the differing tastes, temperament, critical views and degrees of knowledge which belong to their several authors. In other words, the two so called translations will turn out to be nothing more nor less than two independent English works on a subject which happens to have been treated by a foreign author.

Until a comparatively recent period, this has been the rule followed by English writers in attempting to transfer the literature of other countries into their own language. The consequence has been mischievous both to the literature and the modes of thinking of Englishmen. It has confirmed them in the insular prejudices of taste and philosophy which grew too luxuriantly from the native soil of the British mind; and it has restrained the flexibility of the language, and its adaptability to the expression of various and contrasted forms of thought, to which the materials in its composition, brought from a thousand different and distant sources, might have been readily moulded.

Works of the kind above described ought not to be called translations. They are paraphrases, or adaptations, and it is a misnomer to call them by any other name. "How did you like my Homer?" said Pope to the surly master of Trinity, old Dr. Bentley, to whom he had sent a copy of his English Iliad. "A very pretty poem, Mr. Pope, a very pretty poem, — but not Homer," was the critic's honest reply. Bentley, in this answer, not only hit the nail on the head, but drove it in and clinched it. Mr.

Pope, thinking it his duty to write an Iliad as Homer would have written it in English, made in fact just such an Iliad as Homer would have made, had Homer been Mr. Pope. But as no two men could be more opposite in genius to each other, so no two works could differ more widely in spirit, manner and coloring than Homer's Iliad and Pope's Iliad; Homer's is Homer, and Pope's is a very pretty poem, but not Homer. The little Greek which Pope is known to have had, made an important distinction between him and Homer; Pope read his original with great difficulty, and had a very shadowy appreciation of its nicer beauties; he was very ignorant of the local scenery which is painted in immortal colors upon the Homeric canvas; he knew little or nothing of the infinite flexibility of the Grecian mind, which is embodied in the myriad sublime or graceful shapes of Homer's panoramic, all-comprehensive genius; he was a dwarfed and feeble man, dwelling all his days in the close air of the study, while Homer roamed from country to country, from continent to isle, visiting "the cities of many men," and studying "their mind." Homer was equally at home ashore and afloat, among the mountains and on the mountain waves. Not a scene of beautiful Grecian nature that was not imperishably stamped on his mind, and wrought out with unapproachable fidelity in his works. He looked with loving eye (the story of his blindness is all a fable) upon every form of human life, and every work of the hand and mind of man. Pope was a spiteful satirist, nursing in the morbid self-concentrativeness of an unsympathizing life the petty jealousies and malignant passions which made him a viper in his day, and have cut him off in a great measure from the love of posterity. His associations were modern, narrow and personal; his tastes were conventional. His knowledge of antiquity was limited and vague; his mind was thoroughly un-grecian and un-homeric. It was enslaved to the tyranny of a French critical code, and had nothing of the Grecian free and natural movement — had little simplicity and less modesty. For Homer's precise and graphic words, he substituted the sounding generalities of good tea-drinking Queen Anne's age; for the infinite variety of the Homeric hexameter, changing with every object of description and every shifting passion, and echoing to the sense with

sounds that almost seem to embody it on the impalpable air, he has given us the monotonous melody of the English heroic couplet, every line tilting upon the eternal cesura, and keeping its equipoise by the weight of the balancing epithets. How could such a man translate Homer? How *did* he translate Homer? His innumerable infidelities have been admirably exposed in "Wood's Essay on the original genius of Homer;" but a few lines, taken at random, will illustrate our general remarks. Homer's Iliad says,

Οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα,
Ὧ λαοί τ' ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλεν.

'It is not fitting that a council-holding man sleep all the night,
To whom people are committed and so many cares belong.'

Pope's Iliad says,

"Ill suits a chief who mighty nations guides,
Directs in council, and in war presides,
To whom its safety a whole people owes,
To waste long nights in indolent repose."

Every reader will join Mr. Bentley in saying, "Very pretty poetry, Mr. Pope, but not Homer."

We have selected this instance to illustrate the old English principle of translation, because Pope's Homer, so called, holds a fixed place in the literature of our language, and is universally known. The great body of English translations from the ancient classics, including even Dryden's celebrated version of Virgil, falls under the same condemnation.

The true and only principle of translation — we do not speak now of paraphrases — is to reproduce the work of the author in our language, precisely as he wrote it in his. This is the problem which the conscientious translator has to solve. The very form in which the author chose to mould his creation is nearly as essential as the substance, and cannot be severed from it without material injury, perhaps even the entire destruction of the work, when viewed as a work of art. This remark, of course, must be considered as applying to poetical works; scientific treatises, or writings dealing only with facts and reasonings, cannot be said to depend on form for their effect. But the productions of the imagination, in poetry, as well as in the plastic arts, require the author to decide upon his form,

after a careful and profound study of the principles which lie at the foundation of æsthetic science: and the author having selected the form of his work upon well considered grounds, it is doing him a great literary wrong and placing him in a very false position, to thrust upon it another form in another language. The metrical structure of a poem is one of its essentials; if a translation fails to produce that, it is no translation, though it may be a "very pretty poem."

The English translations from the German are the best of the whole body of English versions; and the reason is, that they are the truest. The Germans have in their language a vast body of masterly versions from all the foreign languages which contain works of sufficient value to repay the toil and study needful to transfer them. The remarkable difference between the English and the German translations in favor of the latter, is to be explained by the greater conscientiousness of the German scholars who have executed them, and by the fact that the principles of taste had been examined and settled by profound and extensive learning, drawn from a comprehensive study of the literature of all civilized nations, before the task of embodying in the mother tongue the literary treasures of the world was undertaken; and when it was undertaken, it was done by the ablest, the most accomplished, and the most conscientious minds.

It cannot be said, that the English language is inadequate to the faithful representation of foreign literature. In some respects it possesses advantages over every other modern tongue. The variety of the sources from which it is drawn, and the numerous classes of words that are nearly but not quite synonymous, enable it to reproduce with remarkable accuracy the varied shades of thought in foreign authors. This is not mere theory; it has been proved by repeated experiments. Mr. Longfellow's translations, from nearly all the languages of modern Europe, have the freedom and flow of original works, and are at the same time *perfectly* faithful to the originals, following them line for line, metre for metre, epithet for epithet. One instance like this settles the question. It is very true that to translate a foreign poet upon this principle makes high demands upon the translator. He must be thoroughly familiar with the language of his original, and so complete a master of

his mother tongue, that he can at will, to use the phrase of Milton, compel her "to search her coffers round and round." He must possess an intellectual power and an imagination, if not equal, at least akin to the power and the imagination of his author. He must labor upon his task with profound sympathy, and something of the forming energy which shaped the fused materials in the fervent mind of his original. His duty is, not to place the author in his own condition and age, but just the reverse, to transfer himself to the age and condition of the author; to surround himself, in imagination, with the influences which formed his mind, controlled his taste and established his principles; to lose, as it were, his own personal identity in the personality of his author. If translations have not, as a general rule, been thus executed in English, the fact does not prove the impossibility of the thing, or the inadequacy of the language, but the unfaithfulness or inability of the translator.

We consider this view of translation established, both in theory and fact, upon impregnable grounds. The more recent works in this department have been gradually approaching this standard; and English translators have endeavored, within the last few years, to imitate the learned fidelity of the Germans. At this moment, there are in progress two independent translations of the Iliad in English hexameters. This is a remarkable fact, in confirmation of the opinions we have expressed; the more remarkable on account of the grave and difficult questions growing out of our imperfect knowledge of the real effects of the ancient classical rhythms.

This topic has been suggested by an examination of Mr. Longfellow's recently published work, "the Poets and Poetry of Europe." The plan of this volume is unique in English literature, presenting, as it does, a series of translations from the Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, German, Dutch, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages,— ten in all,— preceded by Introductions sketching, with remarkable elegance of style and condensation of learning, the history of the several languages, and of the literature therein contained; the poets, from whose works the translations are taken, being arranged in chronological order, and each accompanied by a biographical notice,

embracing a short statement of the leading events of his life, and for the most part, a few sentences of general criticism upon his writings, together with references to the principal editions and translations.

Mr. Longfellow's historical introductions are executed with great ability, and abound in graphic passages which present the poetical spirit and character of a whole age in a few magnificent sentences. A vast variety of information is most agreeably conveyed within a very narrow space, and at the conclusion of each introduction copious references are given to authors in various languages, who have treated the subject at greater length, and they thus supply the place of a manual or guide to the student of modern literature, the value of which can hardly be overstated. The translations, being selected from the whole range of English literature, from old Geoffrey Chaucer's version of the Romaunt of the Rose, and the pitiless lady of Alain Chartier, down to the countless collections and magazines of the present day, possess every degree of merit, and are executed upon every variety of plan; the object of the editor being, not to make a collection of absolutely good translations, but to show what has been done in this field of intellectual labor by English writers, and at the same time to present to the reader as fair a view of the various literatures embraced within his scheme, as the materials thus accessible rendered practicable.

Mr. Longfellow's rare endowments, his attainments in every department of modern literature, his whole life, filled with literary labor and poetical composition, his travels and studies in the South and the North of Europe at different periods, the elegance of his pure style, and his taste disciplined to the ready perception and appreciation of beauty, qualify him admirably to plan and edit a work of so comprehensive a character as the volume we are considering; and he has accordingly made it a sort of illustrated history of the literature of modern Europe.

The study of the Anglo-Saxon language is now understood to have important bearings both upon German and English philology, and has accordingly made great progress in both countries within the last few years. But it is peculiarly important to English and American scholarship, because a knowledge of that ancient dialect can alone

afford the means of fully illustrating the pithiest element in our composite language; and will help, with other means, to purify our literature from the multiplying barbarisms with which an ignorant and wordy public speaking and newspaper writing daily overload our common speech, and from the cockney affectations, the false humor, the vulgar wit, and the distorted phraseology of popular English authors, which have been taken up or slavishly imitated by the American literary apes.

Several of the most important monuments of Anglo-Saxon poetry have been edited in the original and in faithful translations, by the English scholars of the present day; and among the rest, an epic poem, of an unknown age, but dating somewhere between the seventh and tenth centuries, entitled Beowulf. The extracts which Mr. Longfellow has furnished from this rusty and obscure old poem, will enable the reader to form a very good idea of the bold, abrupt, and warlike style of our gruff ancestors.

The language and poetry of Iceland — that frozen region where the light of genius burned when thick darkness brooded over the favored regions of the South, is of interest and importance. "The long sunless winter," says Mr. Longfellow, "was cheered by the Saga and the Song, and we are indebted to Iceland for the most remarkable remains of Norse Poetry."

The Danish language has close analogies with the English, and still more with the Scotch, and the picturesque ballads of its elder literature strikingly illustrate the spirit of the chivalrous age in Northern Europe. Like the corresponding songs of England and Scotland, their subjects are partly historical and partly fabulous; and Mr. Jamieson has rendered many of them into Lowland Scotch with such singular spirit and fidelity, that they may be reckoned among the most curious felicities of literature. Mr. Longfellow has wisely selected a considerable number of them from that gentleman's contributions to the "Illustrations of Northern Antiquities." Besides her ballad-singers, Denmark has produced many poets of considerable merit; but the name of Oehlenschläger has stood foremost of them all, both in the estimation of his countrymen and in the regards of foreigners. Though he is indebted for his fame chiefly to the superiority of his genius, he has gained a

celebrity abroad more easily and rapidly by writing his poems in German as well as Danish — in his stepmother as well as his mother tongue, and this has sent his name early over distant regions, where his Danish poems would have long remained utterly unknown. As a dramatic poet, he has been very fortunate in his English translator, Mr. Gillies, a nephew of the historian of Greece. This gentleman's "Horæ Danicæ," published in Blackwood's Magazine some years ago, contains analyses of Oehlenschläger's best plays, together with free and spirited translations of the most striking passages. Oehlenschläger's beautiful drama of "Correggio," from which copious extracts are taken by Mr. Longfellow, has had, by its masterly and exquisite treatment of the artist's life and character, an extraordinary influence in giving rise to the numerous novels and dramas, which, under the name of *artist-novels* and *artist-dramas*, have overrun the literature of Germany.

The Swedish ballads, which Mr. Longfellow has collected from the Foreign Quarterly and the North American Reviews, are well rendered, but have not, in point of style, the antique flavor of the versions from the Danish by Jamieson, which in other respects they strongly resemble. Bishop Tegnér's is, however, the overshadowing celebrity of Swedish poetry. His genius is immortalized by one of the raciest and most original productions in modern times, Frithiofs Saga, of which Mr. Longfellow has given a copious analysis, in English prose that almost equals in beauty and picturesqueness of expression the extraordinary splendor of the Swedish original. This poem has excited great enthusiasm in Europe; it has been extremely well translated in German by Mohnike, and twice exceedingly ill translated in English. Mr. Longfellow has inserted several extracts from the version by Strong, which is a libel upon the great Swede, and two short passages translated by himself in a manner that makes us long to see the whole poem incorporated into our literature by his skilful pen. Among the Bishop's most remarkable pieces unquestionably stands the "Children of the Lord's Supper," written in the classical hexameter, with which the author's studies as Greek Professor in the University of Lund made him familiar. It is a remarkable fact, which we have verified by our own examination, that Mr. Longfellow has re-produced the Swedish

poem in English hexameters, line for line, not omitting a single epithet, scarcely modifying a single pause or word, and not losing a single shade of the author's meaning.

The great importance of German literature has drawn to its study, in England and the United States, a large portion of the talent which has been occupied with foreign subjects. Nearly two hundred pages of this volume are devoted to German poetry, which is divided into seven periods extending from the eighth century to the present day. Of the early German poetry, three remarkable works, the Heldenbuch and Nibelungen-lied are illustrated by copious analyses and admirable translations, taken from the "Ancient Teutonic Poetry and Romance" in the "Northern Antiquities," by Weber. The little interest which these well executed versions have excited in England, is one of the unaccountable literary phenomena of the times. The only names of any consequence that glimmer over the long tract of the third period, are Ulrich Boner, Veit Weber, known as the author of five battle songs preserved in Diebold Schilling's Chronicle, Martin Luther, and Abraham a Sancta Clara, the author of an odd piece of doggerel, entitled "Saint Antony's Sermon to the Fishes." But in the next period we encounter the brilliant forerunners of the great age of Germany—Bodmer, Haller, Klopstock, Lessing, Gessner, Jacobi, and others; whose critical and poetical labors prepared the way for Weiland, Herder, Bürger, Goethe, Voss and Schiller, that unequalled constellation of poets and scholars, which has made Germany the luminous region in the literature of our age,—which has made the era of Weimar seem a revival of those mighty ages in the past, the ages of Pericles, of Augustus, of Leo the Tenth, of Queen Elizabeth, and of Louis the Fourteenth. The scholars of our country have taken the lead in the department of German translation. Longfellow, Dwight, Brooks, Calvert, Eliot, Frothingham, Cranch, and others, have shown more skill and fidelity in the work than any English scholars with whose labors in this way we are acquainted. Compare for instance, Carlyle's degrading paraphrase of Göethe's inimitable lyric, "Singet nicht in Trauertöne," which Mr. Longfellow has wisely excluded from his collection, with *any* piece translated by either of these American scholars.

Passing over the Dutch, who boast of poetical names which

would do honor to the literature, if not to the euphony of any language; and the French, who are well represented by a series of extracts divided into six periods; we come to the beautiful and finished poetical literature of Italy, which is divided into four periods, and fills a hundred and twenty pages. But even here, we have only time to dwell for a moment on a single point — the genius of Dante, the great light of Italy, and the admiration of the world.

That unique production, the Divina Commedia, of which Mr. Longfellow has given an excellent analysis, has been the cross, not only of grammarians, but of translators. The condensation of Dante's language, the austere simplicity of his figures, his antique and solemn turn of phrase, that terse and nervous style which his genius formed out of the rude, chaotic materials of the vulgar tongue, and which fittingly expressed the intense gloom and grandeur and the restless energies of the most fiery spirit that was ever imprisoned in human form, present disheartening difficulties to the translator; and the difficulties are still farther increased by the *terza rima*, which bands all the parts together by its interlaced and continuous harmonies, and concentrates the forces of Dante's awful lines. Cary has translated Dante into blank verse, modelled on the rhythmical principles of the Paradise Lost, which fails to reproduce the stern simplicity of the original. Mr. Wright has lately completed a translation which approaches nearer to the metrical form of the Italian; but his rhythmical series, instead of interlocking all the tercets of a canto into an unbroken whole, completes itself with every six lines. Dr. Parsons has tried his hand upon the mighty Florentine, and rendered the first ten cantos of the Inferno into English quartrains, with great ability, but with an effect quite different from the measure of Dante. Byron has reproduced the episode of Francesca da Rimini with considerable success, in the original measure. Merivale, in whose recent death the cause of letters deplores the loss of a most accomplished scholar, has executed translations of fourteen passages, each of considerable length, preserving the triple rhyme, for the most part, with fine effect. A translation of Dante, however, representing every side of his wonderful genius, is still a desideratum in English literature. Besides specimens from the minor poems of Dante, Mr. Longfellow has given us

Byron's Francesca, Farinata by Dr. Parsons, three passages from the Purgatory by himself, in which he has followed, in ten-syllable blank verse, every word of the original with curious exactness, and Beatrice by Mr. Francis C. Gray, who preserves with singular felicity the effect of the terza rima.

We have no space for comments upon Petrarch or any of the long line of his illustrious successors in Italian poetry, many of whom are fully represented in Mr. Longfellow's volume.

The remaining hundred and forty-six pages are devoted to the romantic and varied poetry of Spain, and the elegant literature of Portugal; but the numerous interesting topics which are suggested by the great names of Lope de Vega, Calderon, Cervantes and Camoens, we are compelled reluctantly to forego. C. C. F.

ART. VIII.—THE MORAL CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

THE perfection of Christ's moral character is a fact. Almost all unbelievers admit the fact, and all believers rejoice in it and derive ever new supplies of moral strength from the contemplation of the deep and holy beauty which shines forth in the person and life of their Lord and Master. It is delightful to know that this sacred ground is common to all. Here there is a resting-place for the mind amid the jarrings of actual life. From this source emanate the purest and noblest influences which touch the human heart and mould human society.

A fact so generally admitted should not only be admitted; a character so generally admired should not only be admired: they should be understood and explained. It would be a desecration of this subject to approach it in the spirit of controversy; but in the spirit of free inquiry and of sincere discipleship it may be permitted us to doubt whether men, either as philosophers or as Christians, have sufficiently accounted to themselves for the fact of this extraordinary perfection of character. Here is an unparalleled phenomenon, a solitary instance of the attainment of a degree of

moral excellence, as far as appears from the records of the race, previously inconceivable or at least not conceived, and unapproachable or at least hitherto unapproached by any other human being, placing at an immeasurable distance the highest virtues of the most distinguished sages and philanthropists that have lived in the world. How did this phenomenon arise? By what means was it produced? We must not be contented with taking it simply by itself, but must examine it in connection with other phenomena which preceded, or accompanied, or followed it, and which will serve to explain the relations in which it stands. We must not be contented with looking at the character of Christ, as if he had suddenly dropped down from heaven or sprung up out of the earth, a full grown and perfect specimen of human nature. As inquirers after truth, we are bound to ask, — how did Christ become what he was? Under what influences was that transcendent moral greatness that he attained, formed in him and brought to perfection?

Is the moral character of Christ a mystery beyond our research and comprehension? It was not so regarded by the first promulgators of Christianity, who, sometimes in the most familiar terms, and at other times with a glowing richness of language, expressly assign the cause of his pre-eminence. In subsequent ages, however mysterious the original dignity of his person and the constitution of his nature may have been and may still be deemed, no sect or subdivision of the Christian Church appears ever to have considered his moral character as invested with the same obscurity or difficulty. Whatever other nature, Divine or angelic, he may or may not have possessed, superadded to the human, it is certain that he lived and labored, suffered and died, a man amongst men, the man Christ Jesus amongst those whom he was not ashamed to call brethren. His moral character as our great Examplar was formed and exhibited on earth. It is placed within our reach, and is capable of being apprehended by his followers not merely in its outward form, but in its inward principle. He has left us an example, that we should follow his steps; but his example does not consist solely in acts performed by him, and to be imitated by us, without any reference to motive. Principle and motive give to external actions their

entire moral value, and if we do not penetrate to the principles and motives which governed the will, and directed the conduct, and formed the character of Christ, it may be feared that we shall lose the full benefit of his sinless example and fail to appreciate its spirit and power.

Every distinct theory of Christianity includes or assumes an explanation of the source of Christ's moral excellence, in conformity with that theory. A brief reference to the principal explanations that have been offered, will introduce the view which it is the object of these pages to submit to the reader.

The Infidel theory first presents itself, and of this there are two forms, one which asserts that Christ was an imaginary, the other which admits that he was a real, person. If he was an imaginary person, then the assertor of this hypothesis is bound to explain the fact of Christ's moral character as described in the Evangelical narratives, as extensively believed on in the world, and as largely influencing the condition of mankind. How did the conception of this moral sublimity of character enter into the minds of the rude and illiterate narrators? How did a mere figment of the imagination meet with such general reception as a reality, and produce such permanent and salutary effects? If he was a real person, then his moral character was also real and demands explanation, which is found, according to this theory, in the ordinary and natural influences of his age and nation. But those influences were inadequate, and influences incomparably more favorable have also proved inadequate, to the production of any other similar or equal effect. A cool-headed and true-hearted unbeliever, that is, an unbeliever with a heart to appreciate moral excellence and a head to understand an argument, must, if he think at all on the subject, pronounce the perfect character of Christ an insolvable enigma.

The Anti-supernatural theory is pressed with still greater difficulties, for while its advocates, with unbelievers, reject all idea of supernatural inspiration and miraculous attestation, unlike unbelievers they are not satisfied with a passing tribute to "Jesus and his principles of social equality," but labor, literally labor, to show how exalted their conception of the moral greatness of Christ's character is. But such moral greatness in a humble Jew, a Galilean peasant, a

despised Nazerine, a carpenter's son; born, living, and dying in an obscure corner of the world; unenlightened by Greek or Roman philosophy; and belonging to a nation composed of skeptics, formalists and mystics, all narrowly and bigotedly national — such moral greatness in such a person so situated must be deemed a moral miracle, even more astounding to a truly philosophic mind than the physical miracles which are rejected as incredible. Both intellectual and moral elevation of character may be increased by culture; but intellectual elevation is chiefly the effect of endowment, moral elevation chiefly the effect of culture. What was the culture which Christ received, to raise him to the moral elevation which he attained? We can understand that a Socrates or a Shakspeare may be naturally endowed with singular intellectual perspicacity and power, but on the theory in question we look in vain for the influences that produced the moral grandeur of the character of Christ. The moral world is governed by laws as fixed and certain as are those of the physical world; and here we have an effect without a cause, a moral effect without a moral cause assigned or capable of being consistently admitted by the supporters of the theory.

On the Trinitarian theory the character of Christ would seem to present a problem no less difficult of solution. According to that theory the perfection of his moral character was a necessary consequence of the divinity of his nature. No one who believes him "very God of very God" can believe him capable of committing sin. But this is inconsistent with the moral struggles through which he passed, which imply, not sinfulness, but liability to sin; and with the value of his example, which would be the example not only of a sinless, but of an impeccable being. If his nature were originally, inherently and necessarily Divine, then his character was originally, inherently and necessarily perfect, and there could have been no moral struggle within himself, no triumph over temptation. In persecution, in contempt, in suffering, in death, he could not have been to us a perfect and sinless Exemplar.

The Unitarian theory of Christianity, as far as we are acquainted with the form which it has assumed in England, presents the moral character of Christ as an example to be copied by his followers, without seeking to explain the

source of his moral excellence or its connection with the religion which he taught, just as the moral character of any of the ancient prophets or righteous men might be offered for imitation. But this, although simple and rational, does not come up to the standard of the Scriptural account of Christ; it practically places him on a level with Abraham or Moses, and it leaves the perfection of his example unexplained. The Unitarian theory prevalent in New England exhibits Christ in higher aspects and relations, as a Teacher, a Saviour, a Mediator in a sense altogether peculiar to himself, and as performing mediatorial offices "which not only take him out of the common experience of humanity in regard to the spiritual life, but lift him above all conception of what is possible for humanity in the natural development of its powers." This very nearly approaches to what appears to the present writer the true idea of Christ's character, but it is vaguely expressed. We need and seek a precise and definite conception of the nature and source of his superiority to all ordinary and even possible human excellence, without which this idea of his character will be fluctuating and destitute of influence.

The author of "Jesus and his Biographers" has presented a new and ingenious theory of the character and miracles of Christ, and he is the first, as far as we are aware, who has expressly recognized the connection between moral character and miraculous attestation. According to this theory a certain mental or moral state was the antecedent condition of the occurrence of miracles, and miracles, regarded as unprecedented but natural events, were consequent upon the possession of this mental or moral state by Jesus himself and by the subjects of the miracles performed. This mental or moral state is described by the term, faith—faith in the power of Christ to produce the given effects. This view is liable to many weighty objections, but in reference to the present purpose it need only be remarked, that there is no adequate explanation of the production in the mind of Christ of this undoubting confidence in his own power, an effect which demands a cause as much as the miracles themselves; nor is there any explanation of the fact, that, with the largely increased means of spiritual improvement conferred upon mankind by the Gospel, there has been not only no corresponding increase, but a total discontinuance, of miraculous power in the Church.

These notices, necessarily brief, do not, it is believed, misrepresent the respective theories, and they may be useful as affording the means of comparison with each other and with the remarks that are to follow. These will be directed to show that the perfect moral character of Christ is fully explicable on the supposition, and only on the supposition, of the divinity of his mission, the reality of his special inspiration, and the truth of the miracles which he performed. Deny these, and his peculiar and extraordinary character is an effect without a cause; a series of moral phenomena concentrated in the short life of one man and largely influencing the entire history of the world, and yet wholly disconnected from all instrumentalities and agencies by which they could be produced; a mystery which it is equally unphilosophical to receive or to reject, because if rejected, it must be rejected against all evidence, and if received, it must be received blindly and unintelligently. Admit what is assumed on the face of the record which exhibits his perfect moral character—admit his divine mission, his special inspiration and his miraculous works, and every difficulty is removed; we have a cause adequate to the production of the effect; we have moral influences expressly adapted to account for the phenomena in question; we have a simple yet sublime history, consistent in all its essential details, of Jesus of Nazareth, the most richly endowed and the most transcendently excellent of all who have ever trodden on this earth. With the reverence due to such greatness, but also with earnest and truthful souls, let us endeavor to trace the influences by which his wonderful character was formed.

Character, in order to possess moral excellence and value must be formed under moral influences, that is, influences which shall leave the will free and unshackled to act or not to act. In the present instance it is not apparent that any moral influence could have been or was employed, except that which consists in *the presentation of truth to the mind.* But all truth is primarily addressed to, and received by, the intellect alone, and it is morally influential only under certain conditions, of which the following appear to be the most essential: first, the inherent importance of the truth or truths presented to the mind; second, the clearness and distinctness with which they are apprehended by

the mind; and third, the strength of the evidence by which they are perceived to be supported, and the corresponding strength of the conviction with which they are held. There may be other conditions which reflection on the subject does not now suggest, but these at least appear to be indispensable; and it seems scarcely possible that these should co-exist without truth, first intellectually perceived, becoming also in a greater or less degree morally effective. Now on the theory of Christianity which we are considering — that which recognises the divinity of Christ's mission, the reality of his special inspiration, and the truth of his miracles, it is capable of being shown that truth must have been presented to the mind of Christ under these three conditions, existing with a degree of force and intensity altogether unequalled and incapable of being equalled in any other case; and that consequently there were the broadest possible grounds on which to build that perfection of moral character, which places him at an immeasurable distance above every other human being that has ever existed or can be expected to exist upon earth.

With regard to the inherent importance of the truths which were present to his mind and which constitute the religion that he taught, they afford the only rational and consistent explanation of the relations of God to his creatures and of the government which he exercises over them, and of their relations to Him and to each other, and of the destiny that awaits them. The existence of the Infinite Creator and Ruler, his unity and supremacy above all that are called gods, his paternal character towards all his children of the human family and their universal brotherhood with each other; his moral government extending to all men, to all ages, to a present world, to a future world, and to all orders of beings; the riches of his mercy to the penitent and humble, and the awfulness of his justice to the guilty and impenitent; these appear to have been the great ideas which filled his mind and which it absorbed and identified with itself. Some of them may be old in terms, and others new; but even the old by their simplicity, consistency, and comprehensiveness acquire quite a new meaning from his lips, and the whole form the only religion adapted to all men, to man as a race. Even for the fundamental principles of what is called natural or absolute re-

ligion, the world is far more indebted to Christianity than Christians generally suppose; and the best proof of this is, that, in the Heathen world where alone we can see what the simple intuitions of reason amount to, those fundamental principles are extensively denied, and even when they are admitted, they are held with a vagueness, with a copious admixture of gross errors and superstitions, and with an absence of moral application, which deprive them of almost all their usefulness. The truths of Christianity when viewed simply by themselves, are thus of the highest possible importance, throwing a broad and strong light on the moral government of God and the moral nature of man, and fitted to influence and control our whole moral being. They were adapted, then, absolutely, and by their own force, to produce the noblest effects upon the moral nature of Christ.

The moral influence of truth is not dependent merely upon its abstract importance, but also upon the clearness with which it is perceived by the mind. A truth obscurely apprehended, will be feebly felt; distinctly apprehended, will be strongly felt. The ordinary mode of acquiring truth is by research, by analysis, by comparison and contrast, by reasoning and reflection; and during these exercises of the mind we are conscious of doubt and uncertainty, and of mental effort to remove doubt and attain certainty. But in that peculiar state of mind which we call inspiration, and which, according to the prevalent, and, it is believed, the true theory of Christianity, consists in extraordinary Divine illumination, there must necessarily be in the favored individual, a total absence of doubt and uncertainty respecting the truths communicated, — a perfect consciousness that this undoubting certainty has been attained without any preceding mental effort, and a clear perception that it is to the Divine Spirit he is indebted for the glorious light that shines within his soul. Such inspiration is not inconsistent with the ever-present and all-pervading influence of God in the worlds of matter and of mind: to deny the possibility of it, is to circumscribe the modes and degrees of the Divine operations. Now our Lord was not left, like the philosophers and sages of antiquity, to acquire by his own efforts a knowledge of the great truths which he taught, to spell them out by hazardous conjectures, to elaborate them by doubtful reasonings, to learn them on questionable au-

thority. They were communicated to him by the special inspiration of God; and of the sharpness and distinctness, the comprehensiveness and fulness in all their parts and relations which truths thus communicated must possess to the mind, it is impossible for us to form any adequate conception. We can only judge that where God is pleased to place himself in special and extraordinary communication with a finite mind, for the purpose of presenting religious truths to its apprehension, those truths must necessarily be perceived with a high degree of vividness and reality, and that just in proportion to the vividness with which they are perceived, and the reality which is seen to belong to them, will be the moral power which they exert upon the character. Thus directly enlightened by God, thus supernaturally inspired by Omniscient wisdom, thus receiving the Divine spirit without measure, he must have acquired a clearness of vision respecting the truths communicated to him, comparable only to the distinctness of material objects submitted to the bodily sight and touch. He must have apprehended the truths of his religion with a firmness and energy of thought which our feeble minds, our skeptical speculations, our low and worldly, sensual and selfish habits do not permit us even distantly to approach. It was not an inefficacious truth that was thus presented to his mind; it was not a single truth, however important; but it was a galaxy of the most momentous truths relating to the being and government of God and the nature and hopes of man. It was these truths in all their life-giving energy that took permanent possession of the mind of Jesus, formed and moulded his character, and purified and elevated his moral nature to the spotless perfection by which he is distinguished.

Still further, the moral influence of truth is proportionate to the amount of evidence and the strength of conviction. Mere clearness of perception, although necessary, is not all-sufficient. A proposition may be distinctly and fully apprehended, but conflicting phenomena and the natural imperfection and liability to error of the human mind, may suggest doubt of its truth. The temptation in the wilderness, the agony in the garden, and the exclamation on the cross, all prove that our Lord was liable to the assaults of doubt, although he never yielded to them. Pure-minded and upright, humble and vigilant, jealous of himself, and

anxious to avoid not only imposture, of which he knew himself to be incapable, but self-delusion, a far more subtle and penetrating error, he might reason with himself and say, "How do I know that in believing myself to be divinely inspired, I am not laboring under self-deception or mental hallucination?" The forms in which the human mind practices deception upon itself even in regard to the most familiar matters, are almost infinitely various; but in religion the mind is especially prone to mistake its own crude imaginings for the inspirations of the Almighty. Now the miracles which Christ by the power of God was enabled to perform, answered the purpose of attesting the divinity of his mission, at least to himself. That this was the sole or chief purpose, the primary or the ultimate purpose, of his miracles is not affirmed. All that is affirmed is, that this was a purpose which they were obviously adapted, and which they were therefore probably intended, to serve. It is the purpose which had a direct bearing upon the formation and perfection of his moral character. How abundantly must his faith in God have been confirmed by the miraculous power which he felt ever present within him, and which he frequently put forth in outward acts! When he felt, and saw, and knew, that at a word, a touch, or even by a mere act of volition, the sick were healed, the dead raised to life, and the ordinary and known laws of nature in various forms transcended at his command, this must, with indescribable force, have strengthened his conviction of the reality of his divine mission, the reality of the divine inspiration which was breathing and burning within him, and the reality of the divine truths which he was thus commissioned to proclaim and enforce upon mankind. Under such circumstances, in the prevailing tone of his mind and manner of his life, there could be, and there was, no doubt, no misgiving, no unbelief. There was the simple and calm confidence of one who knew that he had received the high impress of Heaven. "The works that I do, they bear witness of me." "Father, I know that thou hearest me always." To him of all others the evidence derived from his own miraculous endowments and performances must have been cogent, his convictions powerful, and proportionately cogent and powerful must have been the moral influence exerted upon his whole life and character.

Here, then, we have an adequate explanation of the perfection of that character, by a reference to the extraordinary influences which operated on his mind, and through his mind on his life, flowing from the high office with which he was invested as the special messenger of the Divine will to mankind, from the peculiar spiritual enlightenment which this involved, and from the miraculous attestations by which it was accompanied. On any other hypothesis, his character is a moral monstrosity, unexplained and inexplicable. On the supposition that has been made, his character is at once natural and human, supernatural and divine: supernatural and divine, because, as the cause is above nature, consisting in the special interposition of God, so the effect is without parallel and of God-like excellence; natural and human, because this supernatural and divine cause has produced this unparalleled and God-like effect in a manner perfectly congruous with the known laws of our mental and moral nature. It would equally assume a violation of those laws, if we either suppose any other effect from this cause, or ascribe this effect to any other cause. The belief in a departure from natural laws, in this case, rests with those who deny supernaturalism, special inspiration, and miraculous endowment.

The character of Christ thus regarded is not an isolated fact, a mere appendage to the history of his religion, a single element combined with others of equal or greater significance. A recognition of his true character, and of the sources of its excellence, is necessary to a full appreciation of the whole circle of Christian truth and evidence, and to a full participation in the sanctifying influence of Christian faith and doctrine. Christ is Christianity. Christ is the beginning and ending of Christianity, its first and last and only element. Christ is the living and dying personification of the mighty moral power which the great truths that he taught respecting God and man are capable of exerting upon the human heart and life. He himself believed what he taught. He more than believed. He *knew* the high and solemn and comprehensive truths which he received and communicated, with that deep and penetrating insight which perfect Divine teaching can impart. Those truths, the absolute trust in his God and Father, the filial love, and the suffering obedience which they inspired, made him what

he was — a being peculiarly, extraordinarily, transcendently excellent; towering at an unapproachable height above all who preceded him, lived with him, or have come after him; distinguished alike for the humblest and the loftiest virtues; standing out in equally bold relief from patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, from saints and martyrs, from the ancient philosopher and the modern genius. Those truths cannot be perceived by us with the same clearness, and held with the same strength, with which they existed in his mind. They cannot produce the full moral effects upon us when received through him, as upon him when received direct from God; upon us when supported by miracles which we believe he performed, as upon him when supported by miracles which he knew that he himself performed by the power of God. But although we cannot reach the perfect standard of our Lord and Master, it is something to know that we have not yet attained, neither are already perfect. It is something to escape the error of those who, "measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves," are not wise; a mistake which must always retard moral progress, and dwarf and deteriorate the character. It is something to have a perfect standard before us, which we know has once been reached, and at which we may always point our own efforts. It is something to know that the potent principle and cause of the perfection of Christ's moral character was the perfection of his faith in God and in God's truths, and that we all, imbibing his spirit, imitating his example, and "with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord," may, in constant progression, be "changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord."

The highest thought belonging to this great topic yet remains. In the perfect moral character of Christ, God has revealed HIMSELF to mankind. "No man hath seen God at any time." To suppose that in order to reveal himself he assumed an angelic, human, or animal form, would be to fall back into the miserable and degrading superstitions of the grossest Heathenism. But it is not the less true, and a truth of the highest importance and value, that "the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" — declared him not merely in the rich instruction which dropped from his lips, but in the sinless

example of doing and of suffering which he exhibited to the world. The finite mind cannot adequately conceive of the infinite God. Imperfect and sinful, we cannot adequately conceive of the perfectly holy God. As we can acquire an approximate idea of the infinite only by indefinite additions of finite quantities, so we can acquire an approximate idea of perfect moral excellence only by ascribing to God the highest of those moral qualities which we find imperfectly developed in ourselves. This will still, of necessity, fall infinitely short of the moral perfection of the uncreated One; but it is the highest conception of moral goodness which we can form; and of this highest conception we have a living and practical embodiment in the perfect character of Jesus Christ. In Christ, God has condescended to veil, as it were, the glories of that light in which he dwells, and "which no man can approach unto," — to bring down his own infinite Moral Perfection to our finite conceptions, and, at the same time, to raise those conceptions above the low and worldly standard of ordinary efforts and attainments, to the highest point of moral excellence to which our nature in the present state of being is capable of rising. Hence the pregnant language of Christ himself, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Would that we could forever forget the dogmas of the schools, the phraseology of sects, and the controversies of theologians, and with a deep, heart-inspiring, and appreciating earnestness, behold God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and reVealing Himself unto the world! W. A.

ART. IX. — MEMOIR OF BISHOP GRISWOLD. *

WE have seldom been more agreeably surprised, or unexpectedly interested, than in reading this "Memoir of the Life" of Bishop Griswold. We took up the volume origi-

* *Memoir of the Life of the Rt. Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Eastern Diocese.* By JOHN S. STONE, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Philadelphia. 1844. 8vo. pp. 612.

nally as a matter of duty chiefly, feeling that we ought to have something more than vague impressions of the character and services of one, who for so many years had filled so eminent a station as "Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Eastern Diocese." But formidable as it seemed, (612 octavo pages,) we found the reading by no means a task; we were led on by a continually increasing interest in the private character of the man and the public career of the Bishop, and at the close felt ourselves instructed and edified, and found that the name of Bishop Griswold must hereafter be associated in our minds with the names of some of the noblest, the most devoted, the most useful of the servants of Christ.

It is manifest on every page that Dr. Stone's heart was in his work. He writes *con amore*, in a spirit of reverent, we may say, enthusiastic admiration of his subject, permiting no opportunity to pass unimproved, of presenting in a strong and favorable light the best features in the intellectual and religious character of the Bishop. He writes however in a candid and impartial temper; facts and events are simply, and, we presume, correctly stated; and after making all due allowance for the influence of private friendship and high personal regard, Dr. Griswold stands before us, in this Memoir, a noble specimen of a man and a Bishop; meek, humble, modest, though for more than thirty years the incumbent of an office, whose natural tendency is to make a man proud, arrogant, and overbearing; early and thoroughly trained in all the learning of the schools, yet early resisting all the fascinations of literature, all the temptations the world offers to talent and acquirement, that he might become himself, and help to make others "wise unto salvation;" a zealous and devoted Episcopalian, esteeming this "the more excellent way" of Christ, ready for any labors or sacrifices in its behalf, spending a long life in toil and travel that he might plant this form of Christian faith more widely over the hills and valleys of New England; yet free from the bigotry and uncharitable exclusiveness sometimes manifested by those who assume to be "*the* Church," embracing in his large and catholic heart the good of every name, and rejoicing that Christ was preached and sinners converted to holiness and righteousness of life, though this was done by men to whom the consecrating

hands of a Bishop had never conveyed the virtues of "Apostolic succession," and under other forms than those which Episcopacy approved; severely tried beyond the common lot by domestic affliction and bereavement, yet exhibiting ever a *cheerful* resignation, a childlike submission to God, and that godly sorrow which quickens the conscience in duty without chilling the heart to all that is grateful and pleasant in life.

As we have hinted above, the office of Bishop under any of the great hierarchies of the Christian world is a severe trial of a man's Christian character. Few comparatively have been able to stand the test unharmed and without reproach. It has been thought indeed by some, that a strong moral argument against Episcopacy arises from this source; that it might be fairly contended, that Christ did not give, and would not have given to his Church an organization, that of necessity spreads such snares for the soul, holding up its high offices as a bribe to avarice and a prize to ambition, offering to its ministers almost irresistible temptations to engage in fierce contentions or subtle intrigues for spiritual power. However this may be, it cannot be doubted that the ideas associated with the office of Bishop, and the authority with which it is invested in the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches, make it an office dangerous to meekness and humility of soul, an office that puts to a severe test the Christian virtues of the incumbent. This test, the character of Bishop Griswold met unharmed. He thought more of the responsibilities of his office than of its power; more of its duties than its honor; more of the labors and sacrifices fidelity to his trust required than of the rank and station that trust conferred. We sometimes see the office of Bishop adorning the man; in Dr. Griswold we see the man adorning the office by the meekness of wisdom, the lowliness of an humble, the fidelity of a devoted heart. He seems himself to have been fully sensible of the danger of the office, as is manifested by his remark to the Secretary of the Council in the case of Dr. Jarvis. "I like not," said he, "the accumulation of power in the hands of any set of men whatever. I wish that our Bishops might always be poor, and have no more power than is necessary to the discharge of the proper duties of their office. If the station is rendered one of ease and splendor, improper persons will

be always intriguing and striving for it. But if it is only a place of labor and usefulness, without the reward of worldly honors or emolument, there will be little danger of any one's seeking or accepting it but from desire to do good." We agree with Dr. Stone that this sentiment "was the embodying of his *life*, as well as the expression of his *thoughts*, on this point."

We feel confident our readers would concur with us in the foregoing remarks, could we lay before them a complete analysis of the life and character of Bishop Griswold, as exhibited in Dr. Stone's Memoir. Our limits will permit only a brief sketch, with occasional extracts.

Alexander Viets Griswold was born at Simsbury, Hartford County, Connecticut, April 22, 1766. Like many other eminent men, Bishop Griswold seems to have been principally indebted to his mother for his talents, and for the early discipline and influences that moulded his character. A woman of cultivated intellect, of uncommon energy and decision, she became, in the absence of good schools, his first teacher, and inspired him with that love of learning and those habits of industry which were the elements of his subsequent usefulness. Upon this latter point she was a strict disciplinarian; and the moment her children were old enough to use their tiny hands they were taught some kind of employment, not for the profit that might accrue from their labor, but for the *habits* thereby formed. A kind of netting, called "*bone-lace*," was at that time much used; at a very early age her children were taught to knit this lace, and Dr. Stone justly remarks that "the *boy* who knit *bone-lace* at five years of age, because his mother taught him that it was *a duty* to be always doing something useful in moments which must otherwise run to waste, or perhaps be filled with mischief, was a worthy predecessor to the *Bishop*, who afterwards, with unmatched industry, bore, for more than thirty years, 'the care of all the Churches' scattered over a diocese wide enough for a kingdom."

But it was the influence of his maternal uncle, Rev. Roger Viets, Rector of St. Andrew's church, Simsbury, which more even than that of his mother, formed his tastes, moulded his character, and gave direction to his life. This uncle, considering his nephew a child of remarkable prom-

one year in College. Even this purpose, however, was by subsequent events frustrated." The circumstances in which many of the clergy of the "English Church" found themselves placed at the close of the Revolution, induced the uncle of whom we have spoken to remove to Nova Scotia, whither he was very desirous that his nephew and pupil should accompany him. After some hesitation, he consented; and having formed an attachment to a young lady in his native place, he was married at the early age of nineteen. The removal to Nova Scotia, however, was never acomplished on his part. The marriage, that was to facilitate, ultimately prevented it. His wife's parents, receiving unfavorable reports of the country and climate, "were unwilling that their daughter should go thither." His uncle removed to his new parish without him, in 1789. In closing this portion of the "Memoir," Dr. Stone remarks:

"Of his attainments in knowledge during the first nineteen years of his life, it is difficult to speak with precision. Those years, as we have seen, were not spent, like the corresponding years of many others, in the public walks of learning, in the contests of the schools, and in association with living men famous in the world of letters; scenes, where genius, scholarship, and taste, win their triumphs, wreath themselves in the laurels of fame, and gain for their academic escutcheons an early emblazonry. On the contrary, they were years spent in most simple retirement, in laborious occupation, and in little more than midnight devotions at the shrine of knowledge; in measuring himself, intellectually, with himself alone; or, in making a ploughman's field the only palæstra of his scholarship, and the ploughman himself his sole intellectual wrestler. And yet, we cannot but think highly of his attainments even at that period, if we reflect that, while laboring in agricultural pursuits with others of his age and family, and for as many hours as they, he had, at the time of his unexpectedly early marriage, qualified himself for entering the Senior class of Yale College, and, in addition to all this, read almost every volume in the valuable library of his uncle Viets! What results in scholarship would not such a mind, with such indomitable habits of industry, have achieved, had his whole time been devoted to the gratification of his one insatiable desire!" — p. 53.

After the departure of his uncle, he passed several years "undecided what course to follow." Hitherto he had considered himself as designed for the Christian ministry.

Deprived of the library and the instructions of his uncle, the thought of preparing for orders was in a great measure relinquished. For two or three years he read law some part of the time, not with the design of applying for admission to the bar, but "chiefly with a view of qualifying himself for any business of a public nature to which he might, not improbably, be called." In his autobiography, he says: —

"During these years of indecision, however, reading was not neglected; nor was I uninterested, or wholly unoccupied, in the affairs of religion and the Church. I became a communicant at the age of twenty, and was confirmed, with many others, on occasion of Bishop Seabury's first visit to our parish. In the affairs of this parish, I was much consulted, and not a little engaged. My knowledge of music, and practice of Psalmody, as there were then very few organs in the country, made me of use both in teaching and in leading the choir. When the parish was vacant, and when its minister was absent, I assisted in the other services, and finally, being urged to speak on other occasions, my friends began to think that the weakness of my voice was not a good reason for relinquishing my early purpose of taking orders." — p. 59.

This purpose, therefore, he resumed, and offered himself to the Convention which met at New Haven, in June, 1794; and at the next annual Convention, June, 1795, he was admitted to Deacon's orders. And when we recollect that he was at this time "a working farmer," with an increasing family, that he was obliged to labor all the day on his farm, "and not being able to afford himself adequate lights, was in the habit of stretching himself on the hearth, with his books before him, and by the light of pine knots, as they blazed in the chimney corner, pursuing his studies for hours after his wife and children were asleep," we shall perceive that he must have brought to the ministry a self-devotion and an unconquerable perseverance, seldom equalled, almost never surpassed.

We have dwelt thus long on the early life of Bishop Griswold, because, though not the most important, it is, we think, the most interesting, and the least familiar portion of his history; and because it enables us more fully to understand and appreciate the man, acquaints us with the influences that formed his character and prepared him for his subsequent career. That career, in a few years, became marked

and public. He had invitations to settle from three different places within a few months after his admission to priest's orders, which occurred in October, 1795. Of these, he accepted the least eligible in a pecuniary point of view, and took the pastoral charge of three neighboring parishes in Litchfield county — Plymouth, Harwinton, and Litchfield— and retained this trust till the spring of 1804, when he removed to Bristol, Rhode Island, having accepted a repeated and pressing invitation to become Rector of St. Michael's church in that place. Of his ministry in Litchfield county, Dr. Stone speaks as follows, giving, at the same time, many striking incidents and illustrations, that confirm the justness of his comparisons and his praise.

"His ministry in Litchfield county was as humble as it was laborious; but it left behind a gracious sweet-savor, which is tasted with satisfaction in the remembrances yet living among the hills. His life of toil and lowliness there was, to the world, as unnoticed and unknown as the beautiful stream which flowed through his parishes — seldom seen save by those who drew near, and who, from the brow of the sudden eminences which swelled above it, looked down into the deep and narrow vale, along the bottom of which it held its way. As I passed over the field of his first labors, stood where he so often stood, and listened to what almost seemed the living echoes of his voice, in the accounts given me both of his teaching and of his toils, I could not help thinking of Pastor Oberlin in the Ban de la Roche, and of Felix Neff among the high Alps; not because *nature* here assumes the same sterile, rugged, and awful forms, which she wears there; for the hills of Litchfield county generally swell into smooth and broad eminences, rather than into shaggy and towering heights, and are made vocal with the hum of most industrious life, as it covers them with traces of well paid cultivation; nor because *man* here exists in the same rude and untaught state, which marks his condition there; for this, like every other part of Connecticut, is a region of moral cultivation and of intellectual light; but because here, as there, the scene is withdrawn from the noise and bustle of the great tumultuous world; because here, as there, all is simple, inartificial, rural life; but, most of all, because here, as there, was a man, giving up every thing for his Master; a man fired, natively, with all the ardors of the poet, the scholar, and the man of science, yet making himself one with his people in all the simplicity, toilfulness, and humble fare, to which they were accustomed; a man, seeking singly the good of *all*, and receiving less than love and reverence from *none*." — pp. 74, 75.

The settlement of Dr. Griswold as Rector of St. Michael's, was the commencement of a new era of temporal prosperity and spiritual growth to the parish. It consisted when he went there of twenty-five families and twenty communicants; in a very few years the increase of the society rendered a considerable enlargement of the church necessary, while there were yet more gratifying and equally manifest signs of spiritual growth, in the greatly increased number of communicants, and the deep religious interest that pervaded the whole parish. Here, it is well known, Dr. Griswold lived and labored as a parish minister, during the greater part of his Episcopal life, with a fidelity and success that were at once an example and a stimulus to the clergy of his diocese. He never suffered the honors or the cares of the Episcopate to slacken his zeal or diminish his interest in the duties of a parish clergyman. In 1829, he resigned his parochial charge at Bristol, to assume, in compliance with the invitation of the congregation, and the wishes of many of the Episcopal clergy of Massachusetts, (who desired him to reside in a more central part of the diocese,) the Rectorship of St. Peter's church, Salem; where, however, he did not remain long. The increase of his Episcopal duties, and "the gentle admonitions" of age, made it necessary for him to relinquish the pastoral charge of a parish; and in 1835 he resigned the Rectorship of the church at Salem, and removed to Boston, where he continued to reside, devoting himself exclusively to the duties of his diocese, to the close of his life, which occurred suddenly, February 15, 1843.

A large part of the volume before us is a history of the Eastern Diocese, as well as a memoir of Bishop Griswold. The two things could not well be separated, as the existence of this diocese begun and ended with his Episcopate. Comprising all of New England but the State of Connecticut, it was created by his election, May 31, 1810; and, virtually dismembered in 1838, it ceased to exist, even in name, the moment he died. We could have wished, however, that Dr. Stone had given us more, or less, upon this point. As a history of the Eastern Diocese, with the exception of what relates to its formation, his work is of course incomplete, and, as it seems to us, somewhat confused and unintelligible to all but Episcopalians; while the

constant reference to the public affairs of the Diocese, to the troubles arising from diversities of opinion and the contentions of parties, (which, notwithstanding the boasted unity said to be produced by Prayer book, Articles and Canons, are admitted to exist, awakening sometimes the "awful apprehension" that "the ground beneath her might cleave asunder, and leave the Church in two divisions on opposite sides of the chasm,") serves only to excite curiosity, without gratifying it by a full development of facts and results, — to withdraw attention from the Bishop, and to throw his individual life and character too much into the back-ground. It must be admitted, also, that this was the most difficult portion of the task he undertook to perform, and perhaps Dr. Stone has done it as well as circumstances permitted.

So far as his work is a history of the Eastern Diocese, and of the progress of Episcopacy in New England during the last thirty years, it is full of interest to us as Congregationalists, and suggests several topics upon which we should like to offer a few reflections. Especially should we like to say a few words upon the prejudices "*hostile*" to Episcopacy, once or twice alluded to in the Memoir as existing among the descendants of the Pilgrims; upon the just causes, as developed in the ecclesiastical history of England in the sixteenth and part of the seventeenth centuries, in which originated these prejudices, and upon the influence they will yet exert in checking the prevalence of Episcopacy in New England, and in modifying its essential spirit and character, so far as it does prevail. But our limits will not permit this, and it would be foreign to our present purpose, which has not been controversy, nor the discussion of any of the points at issue between Congregationalism and Episcopacy, but simply to direct attention to the life of an eminently useful and devoted minister of the Gospel, who, though a Bishop, was more of a Christian than of an Episcopalian, and thought more of the Gospel than of any particular forms and organization through which it was to be administered.

With this view, it hardly becomes us to sit in judgment upon the *Episcopal* character of Dr. Griswold. As Congregationalists, we are not perhaps the most suitable umpires in the case. We cannot forbear the remark, however, that

while, in our judgment, he was eminently qualified to be a Bishop any where and at any time, he was preëminently fitted to be a Bishop in New England; and among the causes to be assigned for the progress of Episcopacy in the Eastern Diocese, a prominent, if not the first place must be given to the influence of the character and labors of its Bishop — to the meekness with which he wore his honors, the fidelity with which he discharged his duties, the mingled wisdom, prudence, and perseverance with which he strove to promote the objects of his charge. We had marked for extract several passages serving to illustrate and confirm this remark, but our limits will permit us to insert only the following, which we select because it is a striking incident in itself, and because it shows the spirit of devotedness and perseverance which the Bishop carried into all his labors in every part of his diocese.

"Having reached Newport before the 10th of June, it became necessary to cross Narraganset Bay, in order to keep an appointment, which he had made at Wickford, in the old St. Paul's, or Narraganset Church. But, a violent gale, which had prevented an outward bound vessel from sailing for Cuba, was still raging, and had kept the regular ferry-packet from coming over on that day from Wickford to Newport. Here, indeed, was a difficulty, which would have kept most men housed. The swelling Narraganset, bowing its thousand waves before the strong blast of a still powerful wind and tempest, lay, eight miles broad, between him and his place of destination. Yet, he could not give up, without an effort, his purpose of being punctual to his engagement. By the offer of an extra reward, he induced a strong boatman, in an open sail-craft, to attempt the passage. They set forth together on the dangerous essay. But, by the time they were midway on the water, the boatman felt the peril to be too great for farther progress. Addressing his passenger, therefore, he said; "Bishop, I dare go no farther against such a wind as this!" The announcement was full of import. Still, the Bishop was undismayed. He did not, indeed, emulate the moral sublime of the ancient conqueror, in the inquiry; "Quid times? Cæsarem vehis." "Why fearest thou? Thou carriest Cæsar." But rising above, into the higher sublime of a calm trust in Him who holdeth the waters in the hollow of his hand, he simply asked, — "Why? What is the matter?" "The craft has not ballast enough on her *bottom;*" was the quick reply. "If she carried more ballast *there*, she might perhaps live through the Bay." "Would it help her," asked the Bishop, "if I were to

lie down in the boat?" "No better ballast than that could she have;" said the boatman. The suggestion was no sooner made than adopted. Casting himself at full length upon his face into the bottom of the boat, with the weight of a strong frame much heavier than that of common men, the little vessel evidently felt the favor. She braced herself more strongly to the blast; and though in hourly peril of going down, yet, after long toiling, she reached Wickford harbor, and the Bishop stepped thankfully upon the firm land. Yet, so wet and incrusted had his hat and garments become under the gray brine, which had been splashed over him, that the inhabitants of the village were scarcely able to recognize in him their old and well known visiter." — pp. 351, 352.

Among the influences that undoubtedly contributed to mould and modify the character of this remarkable man, other than those of his early education and position, his domestic afflictions are not to be overlooked. These were numerous and severe, and, without doubt, they helped to chasten and purify, to sustain and quicken that freedom from worldliness, that spirituality of mind, for which he was distinguished. He was not great, in the sense in which the world counts greatness, — not great in the extraordinary vigor and grasp of his intellect, nor in achievements performed under the impulse of one single idea, one strong and towering passion; but he was great in the *harmony* of his character, in the nicely adjusted balance and discipline of all his faculties. Such men are commonly misjudged and under-estimated by their contemporaries. The perfect proportions of a large edifice deceive us as to its dimensions. It is not till we have taken a thorough and accurate survey of all its parts, that we comprehend how vast it is. So the harmony of a thoroughly Christian character, its freedom from extravagance or disproportion in any of its parts, often misleads us. It produces less impression, awakens, it may be, less of reverence and admiration, than a character marked by strong and glaring faults. It is only as we thoroughly study and contemplate it, that we come to perceive its surpassing majesty and worth. Of this kind, it seems to us, was the character of Bishop Griswold. It is not imposing or impressive at first glance, but it grows in beauty, strength, and loveliness as we study it. It presents a singularly harmonious combination of excellent and venerable qualities, the result manifestly not of natural tem-

perament, but of his own self-discipline. He was firm, without obstinacy, independent in opinion and conduct, without arrogance or self-conceit; dignified in his manners and deportment, without parade or haughtiness; modest, humble, retiring, yet with a just self-respect and enough self-reliance to meet with admirable wisdom and prudence any emergency in which he was placed. He was zealous without bigotry, and charitable without indifference. His piety was deep and earnest without cant, and his devotedness to duty heroic and self-sacrificing, without seeking or needing the praise of men to reward it. He was one of those men, whom any Church might be proud to number among its ministers, and whose character Christians of all denominations can study to their profit. S. K. L.

Art. X. — HARVARD COLLEGE — SECTARIANISM.*

Mr. Quincy, through the whole period of his Presidency of Harvard College, has proved himself its devoted servant as well as faithful head. Carrying into the office a force of purpose which had distinguished him in his political and municipal relations, he has administered the affairs of the institution with an energy that has enabled him to impress his own character upon this portion of its history. With unwearied diligence has he labored during the sixteen years of his connexion with the University, attending alike to the details, and grasping the principles, with which it is necessary for the incumbent of such an office to be familiar; "never," as he tells us, "during the whole period having been absent once from morning prayers, three mornings only excepted when he was summoned, as a witness by the court at Concord, on business of the College;" and always ready to turn the powers of his vigorous mind to the questions of academical discipline or instruction,

* *Speech of* Josiah Quincy, *President of Harvard University, before the Board of Overseers of that Institution, February* 25, 1845, *on the Minority Report of the Committee of Visitation, presented to that Board by George Bancroft, Esq., February* 6, 1845. Boston: Little & Brown. 8vo. pp. 64.

which arose out of the circumstances of the institution or the demands of the age. Many of his friends have differed from him on some of these questions, but all have acknowledged integrity of purpose where they may have questioned the soundness of judgment, and none who are acquainted with the history of the College for the last few years can entertain the least doubt, that Mr. Quincy's Presidency will be regarded by future generations as marking one of the memorable eras in the annals of Harvard. He now retires from office in a green old age which justifies the hope that the day is yet distant, when more than a brief allusion may be made to the services which he has rendered in the halls of learning, as in the other employments of his singularly varied life.

It is worthy of note, that almost the closing act in an administration so efficient, and on the whole so prosperous, should be a defence of the College against grave charges touching the wisdom, if not the honesty, of its recent management. The manner in which these charges were presented gave them unusual importance, and the literary reputation and political connexions of the gentleman who made himself responsible for their justice at once drew to them general attention. We do not propose to enter into the history of this enterprise. It is probably well known to our readers. We have no wish to impute other than honorable and noble intentions to the gentleman who offered the "Minority Report," but it cannot be denied that it has been made the occasion of bringing religious and political interests into an odd compact — no, we are not enough in the secret to say that — into a strange appearance of friendship. The eagerness with which certain journals have seized upon the accusations, or insinuations, of the Report, is not an insignificant circumstance. The Orthodox periodical press has been startled into a most painful sense of the duty which it owes to the Commonwealth, while some political editors who had never before betrayed any particular religious sensibility are sorely distressed at the evils of sectarianism. Both parties probably know what they mean, and both perhaps understand one another.

It is on the charge of sectarianism that we wish to say a word. It is only one of the subjects brought forward in the "Report" and noticed in Mr. Quincy's "Speech," but

it is that of which most use is made by those who just now are endeavoring to create a prejudice against Cambridge strong enough to answer their purposes. Of the other matters presented in these documents the most important is the question of expense. Have the expenses of an education at Cambridge increased of late years, and are they greater than the nature of the endowments of the College and its locality make inevitable? Mr. Quincy not only exposes the errors of the Report on this point, but shows that the college charges do not so much exceed those at other similar institutions as we had ourselves supposed. An education at Cambridge, it might reasonably be expected, would cost more than at a College in the interior, where subsistence is cheaper and the habits of life more simple. It is thought however that because Harvard is richly endowed, it must be able to afford its privileges to the young men who resort there at a less price than they would pay for similar, or inferior advantages at poorer institutions. But the truth is — it has often been explained, but it needs to be repeated — the wealth of Harvard cripples her ability; and this, as we have hinted, in consequence of the nature of her endowments. The professorships within her walls have been established upon inadequate foundations, and yet she could retain these foundations only by making up the deficiency. A gift of twenty thousand dollars, therefore, made on the condition that the office which it created should be actually filled, compelled her to take ten thousand dollars more, or the annual interest of this sum, out of her unappropriated capital, and to diminish by this amount her available means. The consequence was, as any one can see, that every such gift tended to increase the charge for instruction, because it lessened the ability of the College to reduce this charge to the lowest point. Still has she not done right to accept gifts, made even with such a condition? Under all this disadvantage, however, the proper college expenses are kept within reasonable bounds, though we do not mean to say that it would not be possible, in some way or other, to bring them yet lower. But provision is made for relieving the needy student of a burthen greater than he can sustain, — provision of which little seems to be known abroad, and concerning which therefore we are glad to copy a sentence or two from Mr.

Quincy's remarks. Many of our readers may be surprised to learn that every worthy student may receive nearly one hundred dollars a year, in reduction of his expenses, from funds appropriated to this purpose.

"The average difference in the cost of an education at Harvard College and at either of the other Colleges mentioned [Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, Williams, and Amherst] is about $40. Now every person, who takes pains to inquire, will find that at almost every other College there are charges, for some item or other, not included in the published statement, but often in the bill; these, in many Colleges, are somewhat high, and parents have complained, as it respects one of them, rather severely. Besides, there exists in connection with Harvard College, in addition to the usual beneficiary aid of from $30 to $50 annually to needy and meritorious students, another fund, established by a number of friends of the College, from which any worthy student may obtain $40 or $50 annually, on loan, without interest during the time the student is in College; and which is enough to cover the whole of this forty-dollar difference. * * * It appears, then, that every student, who is willing to be considered a beneficiary, and in the opinion of the Faculty is entitled to receive aid, may reasonably calculate upon obtaining $80 — on the terms I have stated — towards paying $94, which is the whole amount of "College expenses," technically so called, leaving just $14 to be paid by the parent; — an amount certainly not to be regarded by any one as extravagant, considering the many advantages a student is permitted to enjoy at Harvard College." — pp. 13, 14, 15.

In the latter part of his Speech Mr. Quincy examines the charge of sectarianism, and shows, partly by a citation of facts and partly by an argument on general principles, that it is destitute of any foundation in justice. We are not so desirous as he to disclaim the title of Unitarian, nor do we know that we should not wish to change now and then his language before accepting it as our own. But he disproves the accusation, that the College during his Presidency has been administered on sectarian principles. We cannot transfer his remarks to our pages, and we have space only for a few words upon this subject. We have known something of the management of the College for the last thirty years, from experience and from observation, and we therefore do not speak at random when we say that the undergraduates at Cambridge are not placed under sectarian influences. The administration of the College is

kept free from the taint of sectarianism. We make this assertion on our knowledge, or our conviction, if this word be preferred, and it is for those who charge sectarianism on the officers of the College to adduce their proofs. This they are slow to do. The charge is repeated in private meeting and in public print, is gravely advanced and stoutly reiterated, and what are the proofs which are offered of its truth? Why, first, that the officers of the College are Unitarians. Are they therefore sectarian? Mr. Quincy argues that the inference — Unitarian, *therefore* sectarian — is illogical, and his argument is worth reading. Besides, the officers are not all Unitarians. Secondly, that the last Hollis Professor of Divinity was a Unitarian. But the Hollis Professorship has been vacant for the last five years, and Dr. Ware's instruction of the undergraduates, while he was in office, was in Butler and Paley. Thirdly, that the service on the Lord's day in the College chapel is conducted by Unitarians. But the students are not compelled to attend the chapel services if they or their friends prefer some other place of worship,* and in point of fact not more than half do attend there. Fourthly, that the morning and evening prayers are offered by Unitarians. If it be meant that the daily devotions of the chapel are turned into theological lectures, we think the good taste of the persons who have charge of this service, to say nothing of their piety, might protect them from such an imputation; and if this be not meant, what is meant? Fifthly, that the Corporation is composed of Unitarians. But the Corporation consider the College as a literary institution, and as such watch over its interests; and it would be difficult to show that they have directly or indirectly brought any sectarian influence to bear upon the students. Sixthly, that a majority of the elective part of the Board of Overseers are Unitarians; which Board, including a greater number of *ex officio* mem-

* "Every student of full age is permitted to worship on the Sabbath with whatever sect he pleases. Every student under age is permitted to worship on the Sabbath with whatever sect his parent or guardian pleases. So strictly has this principle been carried into effect in relation to students under age, that, when, as in some instances has been the case, applications have been made by them for liberty to worship at the College chapel, they have been systematically denied, unless they produced a written request to that effect from their parent or guardian." — *Mr. Quincy's Speech*, pp. 39, 40.

bers than the whole of this elective part, originate no measures, and come into connexion with the undergraduates only through examining committees, or indirectly through the confirmation of instructors chosen by the Corporation. Seventhly, that the atmosphere of Cambridge is Unitarian. Outside the College walls there must be a considerable admixture of other elements, if we may judge from the number of meetinghouses to be seen in a walk round the town: and inside the walls we suspect the young men are not sensible of imbibing any strong infection of heterodoxy, or Orthodoxy; the literary oxygen which they breathe does not combine with any considerable proportion of sectarian gas.

We do not recollect any other circumstances that have been adduced in proof of the charge we are considering. We will not ask whether these amount even to a semblance of proof that it is just. Still we suppose that it will be repeated, and men will be found to say, that "the influences at Cambridge are sectarian." Others, who know what is the truth, must say they are not. But cannot we approach this matter in a way to make it clear? Let us try.

What is sectarianism? We shall give a reply to which no one can object, when we say it is devotion to the interests of a sect. We give too the reply most suited to embarrass ourselves, if there be any embarrassment in the case; since we make it include what in other connexions we are far from disapproving. We take then this definition, and we affirm — honestly and fearlessly — that the officers of the College neither in their instruction nor discipline, openly or indirectly, have shown any devotion to the interests of a sect. The management of the institution presents no evidence of such devotion. Examine the textbooks: they furnish no proof of it. Attend the public exercises: they give no indication of it. Look over the lists of honors bestowed in the different classes: they afford not a trace of it. Search the records of beneficiary appropriations: they contain no mark of it. In respect to all these opportunities of serving a sect we will not say that the utmost impartiality prevails at Cambridge, for we may adopt a stronger word — an entire indifference, an absolute insensibility to any use which might be made of them for such a purpose, is exhibited. If there be one mode more effectual than another, by which an influence might be exerted over

the young men to bias them in their religious attachments, it would seem to be the selection of a person to fill the office of Patron. This officer is brought into intimate relations with a large part of the students, through the control which he exercises over their personal expenses. At the time of his death the office was held, and had been held for years, by one of the most decided and prominent members of the Baptist denomination. If there be any method by which it might be thought that a Collegiate government anxious to promote the interests of a sect would attempt to effect this end, it is, by withdrawing the students as far as possible from the reach of other influences than those of the sect which it favors. But not only are the undergraduates at Cambridge allowed to attend any place of worship in the town, (which contains a Trinitarian Congregational meetinghouse and an Episcopal church but a few rods from the College buildings,) but within a short time the Corporation — all Unitarian as they are — have sold one of the most sightly spots in the village to a Baptist society, and at this moment a Baptist steeple is rising within a stone's throw of the College halls, on land that was owned by the College till it was sold for this purpose. If there be an occasion which might be turned to sectarian uses with the least possible imputation of unfairness, it would appear to be the Dudleian Lecture, when religious truth is the immediate subject of discussion. The present year the Lecture was preached by a Professor in the Theological Seminary at Andover, and the year before the last, to go no farther back, by a Professor in the Theological School at Newton, both, as our readers in this neighborhood know, Trinitarian institutions.

But we have not room to enter into details. We must content ourselves with general statements, and we repeat that neither in the encouragements they afford, nor in the restraints they impose, in their distribution of praise or of assistance, in the means they grant or withhold for social religious exercises, in the character of the instruction they give or the nature of the influences they provide, do the officers of Harvard College recognize any sectarian differences. As the student from the city and the student from the country, as the Northerner and the Southerner, are treated alike, irrespectively of the tastes or attachments of the

instructors, so are the Trinitarian and the Unitarian, the Calvinist and the Universalist treated alike, irrespectively of the theological convictions or prepossessions of the officers, from President to Proctor.

How is it then, some of our readers at a distance may ask, how is it that in face of these facts the clamor is kept up about the sectarianism of Harvard College? The question is answered in a single line. Because the institution is under the control of Unitarians. This is the terrible grievance, and this is the foundation of all the clamor. We admit the fact; the College is in the hands of Unitarians. And we maintain that it is rightfully in their hands, and that the interests of the College require that it should remain in their hands. It is rightfully under their control, because they obtained the power which they now hold by fair and honorable means. We perhaps do wrong to say, that they *obtained* this power. It came to them. They used no arts to win or wrest it from another denomination. Harvard University was the nursling of Congregationalism. The Congregational body in this vicinity were its guardians and patrons. The Congregationalists in this vicinity became Unitarians, the College therefore came under Unitarian control. It did not pass from one body to another; the body to which it had always belonged changed its own complexion.

But now a large number of the Congregationalists in this vicinity are Trinitarians; therefore, it may be alleged, they should recover their control of the College. No, we say; for the interests of the College require that it should remain in the hands of Unitarians. This may sound arrogant. Let us therefore explain ourselves. We do not mean to intimate that the Unitarians have more learning or more practical skill than other denominations, that they can boast of better scholars or better literary institutions. We mean only this one thing, — that it is important the College should be kept free from sectarianism. It is free now, occupying a position in which it stands alone among the New England, and almost among the American Colleges, and its retaining this position depends on its preserving this freedom. It should be a liberal institution, where a parent who sends his child there may feel an entire confidence that he will not be subjected to processes by which

he shall be converted into a religious partisan. It should be left untouched by the sweeping wind of revivalism, whose periodical returns are registered or whose absence is lamented in other literary institutions, as if a boy was sent to College not to get an education, but to *get conversion*. The interests of liberal culture and sound learning, which are the true interests of Harvard, require that it should be kept out of the hands of the Orthodox, so long as there is good reason to believe that they would turn it into a theological manufactory. And there is reason enough to believe they would do this, if the possession were theirs. What are Amherst, Williams, Dartmouth, Yale, but nurseries of Orthodoxy? And honestly so. There is no concealment about the matter. A College is thought to be in a good state, when there is "a special interest" about religion among its members. Who is there that does not understand the meaning of this phrase? It is because we fear the use which the Trinitarian Congregationalists would make of their power, that we would not give them the power which they desire. If we believed or could believe they would not make Harvard a sectarian institution, we would cheerfully see yielded to them a large participation in the control of its affairs. They have a claim, growing out of the history of the College, which other denominations cannot urge. It is not a claim which constitutes a right, but it would be entitled to consideration, if our knowledge of their ways did not warn us to be watchful and firm. We accuse them of nothing except the great mistake of using a literary institution for the spread of their peculiar religious views. They would act from principle in making Harvard sectarian. We would act from principle in excluding sectarianism. The controversy, so far as we are concerned, does not regard this or that form of faith, but the great question, — shall or shall not the College remain free from sectarian management.

Just here however we encounter the argument, which is urged with as much confidence and vehemence as if it had some foundation in truth. "The Unitarians have no right to an exclusive control of Harvard University, because it is the child of the State." An exclusive control, by the way, they never can have, unless the people of the Commonwealth should think their political interests so much safer in

Unitarian hands than in any other, that they should elect only Unitarians to the Senate.* But let us examine this formidable argument. "Harvard is the child of the State." Indeed! By what figure of speech is this statement brought within the limits of truth? "Why, the State gave the College its charter." So did the other Colleges of the Commonwealth obtain their charters from the State. Shall we be allowed to draw the inference, that all the religious sects should be represented in their Boards of direction and instruction? So did the Andover Institution. Do those who are so much distressed at the imputed sectarianism of Harvard, see nothing that looks a little like trenching upon "State rights" in the quinquennial subscription? "But the State founded the College." Ah! we have read somewhere in its early history of one John Harvard, who was considered in those days its founder.† "But the Commonwealth has been its benefactor." True, and so have a great many private individuals. Shall their legal representatives therefore be admitted to control its affairs? "But the Commonwealth has been its most liberal benefactor." We suppose that many persons really believe this. Yet it is untrue. What the College has received from the State constitutes a small part of the whole amount of benefactions. The Commonwealth was liberal, according to its means, in the days of their common infancy; but in later years, with few exceptions, it has left, and we will not say that it has not properly left, the University to the patronage of private munificence. "But the College was established for the benefit of all the people of the Commonwealth, and they ought therefore to have a share in its direction." Suppose we admit the force of this position, (though we might thence gain an advantage in the way of retort that

* It may not be known to all our readers, that by the constitution of the Board of Overseers, besides the fifteen lay and fifteen clerical members who hold their seats by election, the members of the State Senate, forty in number, the nine members of the Executive Council, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the time being, are Overseers *ex officio*, and have the same rights as the permanent members, who must therefore always constitute a minority.

† "The character of 'Founder' the General Court never claimed. On the contrary, in the year 1661, in an address to the Commissioners of Charles the Second, they expressly concede the title of 'principal founder' to John Harvard." — *Quincy's History*, I. 39.

might not be agreeable to some of those to whom we are replying,) the people of the Commonwealth are now represented in the direction of the University to the full extent of their rights. Fifty-two members of the Board of Overseers are chosen by them annually. They can send whom they please, and do send whom they please. The people of the Commonwealth have no occasion to complain that they cannot make their will felt at Cambridge.

This mighty argument then, with which our ears have of late been saluted on every side, (and which has been a sad snare to some consciences,) disappears like one of our morning mists in August, when truth rises high enough above the horizon to have its proper effect. The charge which it is intended to support has no foundation in fact, and the present friends of the College need only to exert themselves in disabusing the public mind of the erroneous impressions which are diligently communicated, to see the good sense and deliberate judgment of all, who are not wedded to religious parties or political factions, sustaining them in the course which has been pursued since the institution came into their hands.

Whether certain measures that have recently been proposed will have a tendency to abate a prejudice so unreasonable in its character, yet so industriously fostered, is doubtful. We are glad to know that they had their origin in no such consideration, but in a regard to the permanent good of the University; and we trust that the decision which may be had on their merits will be made independently of their bearing upon temporary excitement. Prominent among these measures is the separation of the Divinity School from the College. It is a happy circumstance, that this proposition was brought forward by a gentleman who cannot be suspected of any leaning towards Unitarianism. If the separation can be effected on equitable principles, we are disposed to advocate it as a means of benefit to the School; for it has long been our belief that if either party was a sufferer from the connexion, it was the School rather than the College. The discontinuance of the Sunday services in the Chapel, and the mingling of the students who now attend there with the different congregations of the town, we are led to think, would on the whole be favorable to their religious improvement. A service exclusively in-

tended for them must lack some of the influences which properly belong to public worship. The matter of the Hollis Professorship is one of more delicacy. We by no means think the Unitarians have here all the argument on their side. It is still, and probably always will be, an open question, what meaning Hollis intended should be put upon his language. The whole controversy turns on the sense in which he used the words, "sound and orthodox." The Unitarians can adduce many circumstances to justify their interpretation; but the Trinitarians can urge considerations of an opposite kind that are far from destitute of force. For either party to talk about fraud or breach of trust, is foolish. The Liberal party acted with conscious integrity in the appointment of Dr. Ware, and the utmost of which they could be convicted would be an erroneous construction of language. The fund which Hollis left yields but a very small part of the salary of a Professor, and we have sometimes wished, that for the sake of peace on a point confessedly doubtful, it could be relinquished by the guardians of the College. A Professor of Divinity there certainly should be in the University, and it is equally plain that in his theological opinions he should concur with those who have the care of the institution.

The College, we hold, should exert a religious influence on the students who compose its classes. And this it may do without admitting sectarianism within its walls. The Professors, and the instructors, should all be religious men. They should not only cherish religion in their hearts, but should express their reverence for it before the young men in the respect they pay to religious institutions, in the interest they manifest for the moral improvement of their pupils, and in the Christian sentiment which pervades their intercourse with them. An influence of this kind they must desire to exercise. It would not mark them as Unitarians or Trinitarians, but as men conscious of spiritual relations and immortal sympathies. Under such an influence combined with its present literary preëminence the sons of Harvard would bear forth from its shades, in their own characters, a sufficient refutation of the reproaches or slanders with which some persons labor to mislead the people.

E. S. G.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Library of American Biography. Conducted by Jared Sparks. Second Series. Vol. VI. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 16mo. pp. 376.

The first biography in this volume is that of Rev. Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College from 1788 to 1795, the time of his death, by Professor Kingsley. It is a well written narrative, sufficiently minute in the earlier portions of it, though the latter part, embracing the period of his Presidency, we could have wished more full. It affords us scanty information of the state of the College and the merits of Dr. Stiles as a presiding officer. A more ample record, we think, was deserved.

The second article in the volume, by Charles Whittlesey, contains an account of the life and extraordinary inventive powers of John Fitch, who, as early as 1788, put in operation on the Delaware a boat propelled by steam, which, as experiment proved, was capable of moving at the rate of eight miles an hour, and which "actually moved, day after day, from six and one-third to six and two-thirds miles an hour," a velocity not attained by others till twenty years later, the early boats on the Hudson falling below that rate. His merits, the difficulties he encountered, his disappointments and sufferings, are described in a narrative which possesses in parts an almost tragic interest. By this biography, tardy justice has been done to the memory of one, whose name, by a singularly untoward combination of circumstances, has remained almost wholly unknown to the public. Of "neglected inventors," it would be difficult to mention a more striking instance than that of John Fitch, though the account given of his last days compels us to withhold from him the praise of the highest moral courage.

The concluding biography, which fills a little more than half the volume, exhibits abundant evidence of ability, discrimination and research. It is by the Rev. George E. Ellis, of Charlestown, and contains an account of the celebrated Anne Hutchinson, with a "Sketch of the Antinomian controversy in Massachusetts." This carries us back to the early days of the history of the Massachusetts Colony, and a most vivid, and we believe a true picture, Mr. Ellis has given us of the distracted state of the settlement, agitated and torn by religious dissentions. Into the question of Mrs. Hutchinson's opinions as a matter of polemic divinity, Mr. Ellis has entered so far as he had reason to suppose the reading public would be willing to go along with

him, and as was necessary to make the biography intelligible. We think that he has gone as far as good taste and judgment required, and no farther. He has shown great industry in examining and collating records, and we do not see that he has left any point untouched about which an enlightened curiosity would suggest an inquiry. The narrative, the style of which is vigorous and animated, we think entitled to the credit of entire impartiality. Parts of it are attended with a painful interest; and the whole account teaches a lesson of the sad effects of bigotry and intolerance, which should not be lost upon the world. L.

The Soul; or, An Inquiry into Scriptural Psychology, as developed by the Use of the terms, Soul, Spirit, Life, etc., viewed in its bearings on the Doctrine of the Resurrection. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew in New York City University. New York. 1845. 12mo. pp. 141.

This book is intended to fortify on scriptural grounds, the theory maintained chiefly by physiological arguments in the author's late work on the Resurrection of the body. The theory is, that the *sensitive* soul, as well as the rational principle, called the spirit, survives at death, and that the former constitutes a sort of vehicle of the latter and the medium of its continued sensations. The writer endeavors to ascertain the true import of the original scriptural terms translated, life, soul, spirit, breath, mind, understanding, heart, etc. This he does by the collation of a multitude of passages in which the terms occur, and to one who is desirous of pursuing the inquiry the work will really afford very great help. The Professor arrives at the conclusion, that the "leading and paramount" signification of *soul* is person,—"the soul is the man himself, as a living, thinking, feeling, active being." The argument then is, that if this being, which we call self, survives at death, both the rational and sensitive soul must survive. The latter may be material or immaterial; it is the receptacle of the higher spiritual principle, and will constitute its body and its medium of sensation and feeling in a future state. We cannot here go into an examination of this theory, which, it will be perceived, is founded on the old triplicate division of man into body, and animal and rational soul. Independently of the theory, the work is valuable, as before intimated, from the numerous texts of Scripture which are brought together, in which the different terms referred to occur, the original term, Hebrew or Greek being given with the translation. The preliminary remarks contain some very just and liberal views on the mutual relations of reason and revelation.

L.

A Commentary on the New Testament. By Lucius R. Paige. Vol. II. Luke, John. Boston: B. B. Muzzey. 12mo. pp. 414.

We expressed a favorable opinion of Mr. Paige's first volume, and there is no falling off certainly in this; though, embracing, as it does, the Gospel of John, the most spiritual, as it is generally esteemed, of the Gospels, and in parts the most difficult of explanation, the qualifications of the commentator may be considered as having been fairly put to the test. We do not detect in Mr. Paige any deficiency in this respect. His commentary gives evidence of a just estimate of the value of spiritual truth in its application to the wants of the soul, with as much of critical learning as is needed in a work intended for popular use. The expositions given, though not in all instances such as we might offer, are generally, we think, sound and rational, and the commentator's own opinions, when he differs from others, are expressed with modesty and in a Christian spirit. L.

Lowell, as it was, and as it is. By Rev. Henry A. Miles. Lowell. 1845. 18mo. pp. 234.

Mind among the Spindles. A Miscellany, wholly composed by the Factory Girls. Selected from the Lowell Offering. With an Introduction by the English Editor, and a Letter from Harriet Martineau. Boston: Jordan & Co. 1845. 16mo. pp. 214.

American Factories and their Female Operatives; with an Appeal on behalf of the British Factory Population, and Suggestions for the improvement of their condition. By the Rev. William Scoresby, D. D., Vicar of Bradford, Yorkshire, etc. etc. From the London edition. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1845. 16mo. pp. 136.

Mr. Miles has prepared a pleasant and instructive book, containing a large amount of information, carefully collected and well digested, obtained from the best sources and arranged under convenient titles. We thank him for bringing so much valuable and trustworthy matter within so small a compass, and we believe his little volume will find many readers. It presents a picture of rapid growth and material prosperity, of which New England furnishes no other example; but what is yet better, it exhibits, in the social and moral condition of the people of Lowell, the result of influences which have made New England both what it was and is. The evidences which are here given of good order, virtuous character, and mental culture which prevail among the operatives, are such as may astonish, but must convince those, whether in this country or abroad, who may have

been disposed to question the possibility of impressing these features on a large manufacturing community.

We have given the titles of the two last named works, in connexion with Mr. Miles's, not only because they conduct the reader to the same spot, but because they leave similar favorable impressions. "Mind among the Spindles" consists of extracts from the *Lowell Offering*, a publication which seems to have filled our English friends with amazement, and which, we are sorry to learn from Mr. Miles, is soon to be discontinued. The Introduction, with Miss Martineau's Letter, is intended to prepare the English reader for what he will find in the subsequent pages. Dr. Scoresby was a candid and intelligent traveller, and his remarks upon what he saw at Lowell exhibit correct judgment as well as fair observation, while his suggestions to his own countrymen deserve their serious consideration. G.

The Fruits and Fruit Trees of America: or, the Culture, Propagation, and Management, in the Garden and Orchard, of Fruit Trees generally; with Descriptions of all the finest Varieties of Fruit, native and foreign, cultivated in this Country. By A. J. DOWNING. New York and London. 1845. 12mo. pp. 584.

MR. DOWNING is already well known to the public as the author of treatises on "Landscape Gardening and Rural Architecture," and "Designs for Cottage Residences," the former of which has been already noticed in our journal, and both of which we believe are exerting an influence, of which there was certainly sufficient need in this country. The present volume, we should say, will fully sustain the writer's reputation for careful observation and diligent inquiry, and its appearance will be welcomed by all lovers of choice fruit. We Americans have yet much to learn on the subject of fruit-gardens and orchards, and among our real benefactors are those who, like Mr. Downing, lay open to us all the riches they are capable of containing. The work is designed to combine, as far as is practicable or necessary, a scientific and popular description of the qualities of fruits, and furnish all the knowledge which is needed to enable persons to select the best kinds, and adopt the best modes of culture. Engravings in *outline*, exhibiting the more important varieties of fruit are given, which may be relied upon as correct, being traced directly from specimens the author had before him, most of them taken from his own garden. We understand that some copies are to be furnished with colored engravings, executed in Paris, which will greatly enhance their beauty and value. L.

The Character and Influence of Satan. By JAMES HALL WILSON. London. 1845. 12mo. pp. 84.

SUCH is the title of a book which has recently come to us across the Atlantic, inculcating the belief of a veritable personal devil, or "Satan the devil," as he is called. It treats of sundry doings of said personage, especially as connected with several "temptations" from Eve down to Simon Magus, who was little better, the author thinks, than the devil himself, being a very "impersonation of Satan." We announce the publication for the benefit of the curious, having ourselves but little taste for literature of the "Satanic school." L.

A Treatise upon the Diseases and Hygiene of the Organs of the Voice. By COLOMBAT DE L'ISERE, Chevalier of the Royal Order of the Legion of Honor, etc. Translated by J. F. W. LANE, M. D. Boston: Otis, Broaders & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 220.

THIS volume, though not wholly free from technical terms, contains much valuable information respecting the voice, — its formation, mechanism, the diseases affecting the organs of it, its development and various modifications by circumstances and age, with numerous observations on its use, especially in singing. L.

Answer to the "Rejoinder" of twenty-nine Boston Schoolmasters, part of the "Thirty-one," who published "Remarks" on the Seventh Annual Report of the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. By HORACE MANN, Secretary of the Board. Boston: Fowle & Capen. 1845. 8vo. pp. 124.

WE repeat our declaration, that it is time this controversy between the "Secretary" and the Boston "Masters" should cease. It has already involved enough of personal recrimination and verbal criticism—carping at expressions on the one hand, and explanation on the other—the continuance of which must be both tedious and painful to the reader. Still we are bound to say, that Mr. Mann's "Answer" is completely successful as an exculpation of the writer from the charges which had been brought against him, and that if the Masters study their own interests, or the reputation of the Boston Grammar Schools, they will not provoke any farther reply from an antagonist who can handle the "severities" of language with such cruel effect. At times he is needlessly and unjustly severe, as when he speaks of "solid

pages of defamation and vindictiveness," and talks of the "virulence" and "venom" of his opponents. But the pamphlet will answer its purpose as a vindication and reply. And here we trust the strife will end between those who can only have a common cause at heart. G.

Discourse delivered at Bolton, Dec. 26, 1844, at the Re-Dedication of the Church belonging to the First Parish. By RICHARD S. EDES, Minister of said Parish. Worcester. 1845. 8vo. pp. 15.

Intellectual and Moral Influence of Romanism. A Dudleian Lecture delivered before the University in Cambridge, May 14, 1845. By Prof. EDWARDS A. PARK, of Andover Theological Seminary.

A Discourse on the Life and Character of the late Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, delivered in the North Church, Salem, Mass., Sunday, May 18, 1845. By JOHN BRAZER, D. D., Pastor of the North Church and Society. Salem. 1845. 8vo. pp. 52.

Our Private and Public Stewardship. A Discourse preached before the First Congregational Society in Watertown. By Rev. JOHN WEISS. Cambridge. 1845. 8vo. pp. 15.

SIMPLE in its language and affectionate in its appeals, Mr. Edes's Discourse must in an unusual degree have met the feelings awakened by the occasion and place of its delivery. — Professor Park's Dudleian Lecture may be briefly characterized as exhibiting remarkable vigor and condensation of thought and powerful argument, with copious and apt historical illustrations and references. It is original, profound and impressive, dealing in subtle analysis, and appealing to great principles of human nature. In the pamphlet literature of the day we rarely meet with a production of so much merit. — Dr. Brazer's Discourse is a worthy tribute to one of the worthiest and best of men, — dwelling on his intellectual, moral, and social qualities, giving a prominent place to "the sentiment of reverence," which the author thinks was "the most distinctive, as well as crowning grace" of his character. Appended to the discourse are notices of Mr. Saltonstall by Hon. S. C. Phillips, and Rev. Dr. Flint, with other documents attesting the sense widely entertained of his worth. — The subject of Mr. Weiss's Discourse appears to have been suggested by a recent occurrence in the place in which he resides, and contains a plain and earnest exposition of the doctrine of responsibility not only for personal sins, but, in a degree, for the moral character of the "town" or community in which one lives.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — We grieve at the frequent occasion we have to notice the resignation or suspension of the ministry in consequence of insufficient health. — Rev. Mr. Ware of West Cambridge has been obliged to ask a dismission from his people on this account. — Rev. Mr. Farley, of Eastport, Me., has left his congregation from want of strength to endure longer the amount of service on that distant spot. — Rev. Mr. Bates of Ashby has been compelled by the state of his health to ask a dismission from his charge. — Rev. Mr. Dall, finding his health unequal to the discharge of the duties of the ministry-at-large in Baltimore, has returned to Boston. — The venerable Dr. Eaton of Boxford has retired from the ministry, on account of his extreme age. — Rev. Mr. Smith of Warwick has resigned his ministry in that place. — Rev. Mr. Gage has left the society in Petersham. — Rev. Mr. Hinckley has closed his connexion with the church in Windsor, Vt. — Rev. Dr. Gilman of Charleston, S. C., is too seriously ill to permit his conducting the public services of the church. — Rev. Mr. Sears of Lancaster has been for some months obliged to abstain from preaching, and is still affected by chronic disease. — Rev. Mr. Withington of Leominster has been taken off from his labors by an illness which will render a longer period of rest necessary for his restoration.

A Unitarian society has been organized in Troy, N. Y., to whose members, for the present, Rev. Mr. Harrington of Albany preaches once on the Sunday. A suitable place of worship has been purchased for their use. — Measures have been taken for opening a place of Unitarian worship, and forming a religious society, at East Boston. — A Unitarian congregation has been assembled at Toronto, Canada, and partial arrangements made for the support of public worship in a meetinghouse which the Methodists have vacated, and of which the Unitarians can make use. — The measures for the formation of a second Unitarian society in Lowell have been so far completed, that a preacher has been engaged. — A new Unitarian society in Pomfret, Vt., have their meetinghouse nearly ready for dedication.

Cambridge Divinity School. — The annual Visitation of the Divinity School at Cambridge took place on Friday, July 18, 1845. The graduating class was larger than usual, and we were glad to see a larger audience than in former years. The dissertations — thirteen in number — were on the following subjects: — "The Christian Church, as designed by our Saviour" — Mr. Frank P. Appleton; "The strength and weakness of Romanism" — Mr. George M. Bartol; "The application of Christian ethics to social reforms" — Mr. Henry F. Bond; "The periodical return of errors" — Mr. Noble Butler; "Exposition of Romans viii. 19 — 23" — Mr. Edward Capen; "The obligations of laymen in a Christian society" — Mr. John Ellis; "The alleged tendency of a critical study of the Scriptures to diminish

their power over the heart"—Mr. Cornelius G. Fenner; "The Scholastic philosophy in connexion with Christianity"—Mr. William B. Greene; "The mythical theory of Strauss"—Mr. Thomas Hill; "Hugh Latimer, as a preacher and reformer"—Mr. John F. Moors; "Asceticism in the Church"—Mr. Ephraim Nute jr.; "Christianity considered as the principle of human progress"—Mr. James Richardson jr.; "The ancient and the modern Martyr"—Mr William O. White. The dissertations were well written, and generally read with propriety and effect. The variety of subjects gave opportunity for showing the extent of study through which the young men had been carried, and the manner in which the subjects were treated furnished proof of faithful intellectual discipline. If we should notice any defect, it would be the want of a more distinct recognition of the peculiar relation of Christianity to man as a sinner.

The exercises of the class occupied the forenoon. After dining together in Harvard Hall, the Alumni held their annual meeting, as an Association, in the College chapel, when the officers of the last year were reelected. Rev. George R. Noyes, D. D. was chosen second Speaker for the next anniversary, in case of failure of Rev. Dr. Peabody to deliver the annual discourse. A report was made by a Committee appointed the last year to consider if any provision can be made for the relief of destitute or disabled preachers. As they had found it difficult to devise any general plan, they recommended that each case, as it may arise, be presented to the Association for their action. The Report was adopted. A resolution expressing the regard of the Alumni for the late Dr. Ware was offered and adopted, in the following words:—

"*Resolved*, That the death of the late Rev. Henry Ware, D. D., is an event which this Association cannot allow to pass without expressing their grateful recollection of the preeminent services, which, as an instructer and a writer, he had rendered to the cause of Christian truth and freedom, to the interests of biblical learning, and especially to the ministerial profession, so many of the members of which he had been instrumental in preparing for their work; as well as the mournful pleasure which they have in recalling the admirable union of candor and ability, of the scholar's and the Christian's traits, which was seen in his life, as it was exemplified in his writings."

At 4 o'clock the Association adjourned to the Unitarian meeting-house, to listen to the Annual Address, from Rev. Alvan Lamson, D. D. of Dedham. Dr. Lamson had chosen for his subject "The importance of theological science and thorough scholarship in the ministry at the present day," and after speaking of an apparent tendency to a comparative disregard of such studies, with some of the causes which may have induced this depreciation, he exhibited their high value in relation to the individual mind, to science and history, to the religious questions and problems of the time, to the interests of theology, and to the character of our denomination; concluding with a notice of the inadequate provision which the public have made for instruction at our Divinity School.

After the Address the Association again met for business, and appointed a Committee to see if by some change in the arrangements for the next meeting more time might not be found for general discussion. Rev. Mr. Stebbins made some interesting statements respecting the condition and prospects of the School at Meadville.

The annual Discourse before the Senior Class of the Divinity School was preached on Sunday evening, July 13, by Rev. Andrew P. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H., on the philosophical, spiritual and practical objections to the theory of the anti-supernaturalist.

We learn that the gentlemen who have just left the School have at once found employment in our vacant pulpits.

Meadville Theological School. — The annual Visitation of this School took place on Thursday, June 26, 1845. Dissertations were read by the members of the class which had been under instruction the first year — nine in number; four of whom were from Pennsylvania, one from Ohio, one from the State of New York, and three from Massachusetts. The subjects were so chosen as to exhibit the various branches of theological study which had been pursued, and the dissertations afforded ample proof of the fidelity of the teachers and the diligence of the students. The Visiting Committee, in whose presence the exercises were conducted, consisted of Elder J. E. Church of Pennsylvania, of the Christian Connexion, and Rev. C. Lincoln of Massachusetts, of the Unitarian denomination. In their Report they express great satisfaction in all which they heard and saw, and "entire confidence in the institution, which they commend to the sympathies and good-will of their fellow-disciples." The anniversary sermon was preached in the evening of the day of the visitation by Rev. Mr. Lincoln.

During the first year the existence of this School may be said to have been an experiment, in regard both to the support it would receive and the instruction it might be able to afford. The result in both respects has been even beyond the hopes of its friends. A class of nine have been carried through a great deal of study connected with the profession which they had chosen, and on which some of them had already entered. They will all probably remain in the School another year, and will be joined, there is every reason to believe, by twelve or fifteen others, making the whole number the next year between twenty and thirty. The studies have been so arranged as to allow of a student's remaining one, two, or three years, as may be practicable or convenient for him. The expenses which he must incur are extremely small. For the forty weeks of term-time in the year, the charge for board, instruction, rent, fuel and all other items except clothing, need not much exceed thirty dollars; and text-books are furnished for the use of the students from the library. A house has been hired in which most of the members of the School may both live and board, and every arrangement has been made to give them such accommodation as shall combine comfort with cheapness. The resident Professors, Messrs. Stebbins and Huidekoper, are devoted to the interests of the institution, and have encouraged by their sympathy and example the spirit of earnest study and personal sacrifice which has been manifested by their pupils.

We believe this School, which we may now consider as established on a permanent basis, is destined to become, and indeed must at once become, an important instrument in the diffusion of correct views of Scripture and of religion throughout the Western States. Its students will be drawn chiefly from the Christian Connexion, who with scarcely an exception look with favor upon the School, and many of

whose ministers take a deep interest in its success. They will return from the School to their homes, to carry into the denomination whence they came the fruits of a more careful and systematic study of the Scriptures, and a more thorough preparation for their duties, than they would have obtained without its aid; and through them the preaching of this body, without losing its directness or fervor, will acquire greater compass of thought and more chasteness of expression. The institutions at Cambridge and at Meadville are both needed. No jealousy can arise between them, for the friends of one must be the friends of both,—even all who are the friends of a liberal culture, an enlightened piety, and a biblical faith.

Other Denominations.—The most important event in the history of any of the religious denominations in this country since the schism in the Presbyterian Church, is the disruption of the Methodist Church of the United States, by the secession of all or most of the Southern and Southwestern members, who have adopted a separate organization, under the name of the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South." The cause of this movement was the action of the Northern churches and of the General Convention on the subject of Slavery, by which the Southern Methodists felt themselves aggrieved. The doctrine and discipline of the Church remain unchanged, in the parts into which it is now divided; yet serious consequences may follow, in respect not only to its strength, but its distinctive character.

A schism has arisen from the same cause in the Baptist denomination, which cannot, however, so vitally affect the interests of the body, because they were not bound together by a system of ecclesiastical discipline like that to which Wesley subjected his Church. In consequence of certain declarations of the Baptist Missionary Boards, in regard to the employment of slaveholders as missionaries, a Southern Convention was held at Augusta, Ga., in May last, and a "Southern Baptist Convention" was organized, "to promote foreign and domestic missions," the members of which have withdrawn from any farther connexion with the Home Mission Society and Foreign Mission Board, which for many years have had charge of these interests among the Baptists. We regret these divisions, particularly in their bearing on our political Union. They tend to weaken the bonds which should unite the people of the whole country. Religious sympathy and co-operation are among the most effectual means of abating or counteracting the sectional prejudices which spring up in different parts of the land, and we grieve to see distrust and alienation taking their place.

At the late meeting of the General Assembly of the "Old School" Presbyterian Church, held at Cincinnati, it was decided, by a vote of 169 to 14, that "baptism in the church of Rome is not valid." In the course of the discussion, Rev. Dr. Rice coolly remarked:—"Unitarian baptism is not allowed valid. Why? Because it is not a church of Christ. So I say with Rome." The same body confirmed a previous decision, pronouncing marriage with the sister of a deceased wife unlawful. They also acted on the question of Slavery, which was brought before them by various petitions or memorials, and pronounced, by a vote of 164 to 12, that the bond of union in the Presbyterian Church in the United States rests "upon the conceded principle, that the existence of slavery under the circumstances in which

it is found in the Southern portion of the country, is no bar to Christian communion." They therefore declined to legislate on the subject. — Some indications have of late appeared of a disposition in the two portions of the Presbyterian Church — Old School and New School — to return to their former union.

The extension of the Episcopal Church in the United States is a subject of congratulation with its members. A comparison of the years 1822 and 1845 shows, that within the last twenty-three years the number of the clergy has increased from 333 to 1,231. In the former year there were 9 Bishops; there are now 26. This is certainly a large increase of ecclesiastical influence, and if the congregations have multiplied in the same proportion—as is, very probably, the case—the fact may call for an inquiry, on the part of other denominations, into the causes of so rapid a growth. We believe they may be found, partly at least, in the preference which many persons feel for liturgical services, in the *flexible* and comparatively liberal theology of the Articles, and in the notion, which facts are every day making more conspicuously false, but which some are credulous enough still to entertain, that they shall here find a refuge from religious controversy. — The Bishopric in Pennsylvania lately held by Rev. Henry Onderdonk, D. D., has been filled by the election and acceptance of Rev. Alonzo Potter, D. D., of Union College, Schenectady. In this instance the struggles of the two parties in the Church resulted in a most judicious selection for the vacant Episcopate. — Neither the trouble nor the scandal which was brought upon the church by Bishop Onderdonk of New York is ended. Though debarred from the discharge of Episcopal functions, he is still the Bishop of the diocese, and his friends are evidently maturing measures to restore him, if possible, to his former position. It is plain that theological, as well as moral feeling, is an element in this unhappy matter.

An "open rupture" has taken place among the Friends, or Quakers; a part having deviated from the original doctrines of the sect, toward Episcopal views. The schism is said to have had its origin in Mr. Gurney's late visit to this country. Of the fact of a serious division in the body we have no doubt, but are ignorant of its precise character and extent.

The members of the New Jerusalem Church in this city have finished and dedicated their new house of worship. Although its external appearance will not attract notice, it has been erected at considerable expense, and the interior arrangement and finish must secure general admiration. A novel feature in the plan of the interior is a circular projection from the wall of the house opposite the entrance, reaching from the floor nearly to the ceiling, and occupying the place which in a Congregational meetinghouse is taken for the pulpit—here placed on one side, as in Episcopal churches. It is called the sanctuary, and is intended to receive the volume of the Scriptures. In its form and use it resembles that part of a Jewish synagogue in which the rolls of the law are kept, but exhibits more architectural taste. The society here is said to be the largest society of the "New Church" in the world.

We find in all the religious papers expressions of grief at the absence of "revivals" in the churches. As a consequence, the number of communicants has declined rather than increased. One of the papers

states, "as an alarming fact, that it appears from the statistics of the Congregational [Orthodox] churches of Massachusetts now publishing, that the dismissions, deaths, and excommunications exceed the admissions [within the last year, we presume] by 325." In this result, too, the churches of three Associations are not included, whose "statistics will probably increase its number to 400, or more." At the same time, the churches are represented as enjoying, generally, a state of internal order, and as paying due regard to the institutions of worship. Such a state of things, we should think, might suggest the inquiry, whether that can be a sound system which makes the increase of communicants, or "professing Christians," depend wholly on extraordinary measures. — To counterbalance the effect of this annunciation, another statement, not less worthy of notice, has been made on good authority. It appears that within the last fifteen years "*eighty-one* Orthodox [Trinitarian Congregational] churches have been organized" in this Commonwealth, and the list is said to be incomplete. Within the same time, the number of *church-members* has risen from 28,108 to 63,916; that is, the "communicants have more than doubled in the last fifteen years." We wish we could give as good an account of the increase of our churches. We have yet to be convinced that the ordinary means of grace — the regular labors of the ministry, with the constant influences of God's providence and spirit — are not adequate to the production of the effects which every Christian must desire to witness in the open and earnest confession of Christ. If the fault does not lie in our system of means, must it not belong to our administration of these means? The question is one which we ought to ask ourselves, in view of facts and in view of responsibilities.

The Romish Church. — The present condition of the Romish Church must awaken the anxious, or curious attention of every Protestant. Alike in Europe and in this country it has been for some years extending its influence, till the results, which have at last secured the notice of the most incredulous, may well justify an inquiry into the means which should be taken to arrest the growth of a Church, which has always been found hostile to a free study of the Bible and the personal independence which such study promotes. There can be no doubt that by conversion as well as immigration the Roman Catholic Church of the United States has increased in numbers of late, and is daily increasing. In England, to say nothing of the anti-Protestant movement within the Establishment, instances of conversion to the ancient faith frequently occur, and the whole external aspect of Romanism in Great Britain at this time may be said, by one who should speak within bounds, to indicate confidence and prosperity. What effects will follow from the endowment of Maynooth College, an avowedly and exclusively Catholic institution, and the establishment of Colleges in Ireland at the expense of Government, free from a religious character of any kind, time alone can show; but we shall be surprised to learn, that Romanism has not drawn new strength from the patronage which has been extended to it. Many of the friends of the Established Church see in the endowment of Maynooth the preparatory step to a public provision for the Catholic clergy, if not of the ministry of all denominations, and are seriously alarmed.

On the continent the most remarkable feature in the recent history of the Papal Church is the recovery by the Jesuits of a large part of their former influence. The proofs of this fact accumulate every day, and the revival in Catholic Europe of an Order which once reigned, with a despotism the more frightful for its secrecy, from the palace to the hovel, is a circumstance that should attract the notice, if it do not alarm the fears of the friends of liberty and of man. In Switzerland serious troubles, and bloodshed, have been the consequence of the attempts of the Jesuits, through their friends, to control the public measures of some of the Cantons, and of the Confederacy. In France their interference with the subject of education, and open endeavors to regain this great means of influence, have shown a consciousness of power which they have not manifested before for a long period: and while the Government temporise, such orators as Thiers and such writers as Eugene Sue are calling attention to the character of this ambitious and dangerous brotherhood. According to the latest information that has reached this country, the King of the French, unwilling to enforce directly the laws for the suppression of the Jesuits, has obtained from the Pope instructions for their removal from the kingdom.

On the other hand, however, the Romish Church finds itself involved in new and unexpected difficulties. Another Reformation has broken out in Germany, which may have a serious effect upon the stability of the Papal power. John Ronge, a native of Prussian Silesia, now but in his thirty-third year, having dared to question the purity of motive which governs the Pontiff in his administration of the Church, was deposed from his ministry; only however to become a more resolute assailant of the Church whose character he was led more closely to examine. Upon the public exhibition of a pretended relic — "the holy coat of our Lord" — in the cathedral at Treves, under circumstances which seemed to belong to the sixteenth century rather than to our own day, Ronge published an address to the people, full of truth and energy, exposing the immorality of the whole affair. The effect was beyond what even he could have anticipated. His letter was read, the eyes of many persons were opened; the Church became furious, the priest remained firm; friends gathered around him, he was led to larger and clearer discoveries of truth, and the consequence has been the formation of a new "German Catholic Church," the members of which, without connecting themselves with any of the Protestant sects, have renounced allegiance to the Pope, and adopt as fundamental articles the essential principles of Protestantism. Ronge has prepared a Confession of faith, which is wonderfully liberal in its language and spirit. It contains nothing to which we could not heartily assent. He has been recently called to take charge of a congregation formed on these principles in Breslau, where he will occupy a position that must give him important advantages in the contest in which he is at present the leader. The Government have refused to interfere for the suppression of the new Church, and though in Austria it may be discountenanced if not prohibited, in Prussia it will have an open field. The German press has seized upon this new topic with its usual avidity, and publications have been multiplied for and against the Rongist movement.

Another outbreak of a similar character has taken place in Prussian Poland. The Catholic parishioners of Schneidemuhl, in the Duchy of

Posen, having learned to distrust Romanism from their own study of the Scriptures, on the arrival among them of a curate whose convictions resembled their own, were soon in open dissent from the Church. The curate, M. Czerski, was deposed. His congregation adhered to him, and formed an independent community under the name of the "Catholic Christian Apostolic Church," to which the Government has given its sanction. This movement is distinct from that under Ronge. Czerski and his friends adopt a more "positive" expression of faith than Ronge and his disciples; they accept the phraseology of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, and lay special stress on the doctrine of "justification by faith," as interpreted by the "more orthodox" of the Protestant sects.

It is not probable that so strongly marked a tendency towards freedom of inquiry and action can be checked except by the strong arm of Government. Whether we shall hear of other secessions, each under its own name or organization, or whether the two bodies now formed will be merged in one which shall spread throughout Germany, or whether they will be absorbed into Protestantism, as that now exists in Europe, it is impossible as yet even to form a reasonable conjecture. The last of these results we should regret. Ronge and Czerski and their followers would only cripple their power by connecting themselves with any of the Protestant Communions. Let them be Reformed Churches of a freer spirit and more consistent bearing.

The Romish Church is not exposed to internal troubles alone. If the testimony given at the late anniversaries in New York and in this city may be credited, the Pope's comfort is much disturbed by the successful efforts of American Protestants, who have undertaken the subversion of his power in the very seat of its strength. A direct assault upon Romanism in Europe is a favorite measure with many in this country, and would seem just now to be the subject which attracts most interest. At the late meeting of the "Christian Alliance" Society the zeal of the members waxed very warm, and their hope leaped over difficulties at a bound. Seriously, however, we believe something may be, and has been effected by the agents employed by Societies in this country in selling bibles, distributing tracts, and preaching, among the Catholic population in Europe. Our readers may not know that there are three Societies engaged in this work, — the Foreign Evangelical Society, the American Protestant Society, and the Christian Alliance. The first of these has been organized six years, has for its Secretary Rev. Dr. Baird, an energetic and well-informed man, and besides operations in Germany, Sweden, Canada, and elsewhere, is especially engaged in effecting an entrance for sounder views of religion into France, Belgium, and Italy, by co-operating with a "Corresponding Committee" in Geneva, at whose disposal it places a large part of the funds collected here. The American Protestant Society held its second anniversary this year. Its plan "is mainly to operate by means of colporteurs." Rev. Dr. Spring of New York is the President, and it has a long list of officers, of different denominations. The Christian Alliance has taken the place of the Philo-Italian Society, and "is formed to carry the war into Italy, and to unite Protestant Christendom in this holy war." Considerable reliance is placed upon the Italians whom political or religious considerations have exiled from their native land, and

through whom, it is thought, newspapers and books may reach the heart of the Papal dominions. At the last meeting a committee, consisting of eight ministers of different denominations, was appointed to prepare an answer to a Bull of the Pope directed against this Society.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association. — This body held its twentieth annual meeting at the Essex Street Chapel in London, on Wednesday, May 14, 1845. Rev. Benjamin Carpenter of Nottingham preached the Sermon, from John viii. 31, 32, on the importance of both Christian truth and intellectual freedom. After the religious services, Thomas Gibson Esq. being called to the chair, the Treasurer and Secretary made their reports; and then there was offered, advocated, and adopted, a resolution of thankfulness and congratulation for the passage of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, and for the feeling towards the Unitarians which on occasion of that measure was manifested in Parliament, and for the exertions of many distinguished men in their behalf. After some other discussions, the subject of the Maynooth Grant was introduced, which it was felt on all hands could not be left unmentioned, but which gave rise to a very animated debate. A resolution was offered, "disclaiming all sympathy and participation with the opposition to the Maynooth grant," which had been "so actively excited" by other religious bodies; and was carried by a vote of 27 to 17. Rev. Dr. Hutton and Rev. W. Hincks were very earnest in their opposition, on the ground that the resolution involved the principle, "that the State may properly interfere with the religious instruction of the people;" and presented their contrary opinion at first in the form of an amendment, and this being finally rejected by the meeting, they cast it into the form of a protest, which was signed by 14 members of the Association.

The meeting at the Chapel was succeeded in the afternoon by a very large and interesting assembly, to "breakfast," at the Crown and Anchor tavern. The tables, filling a very large hall, were crowded both with men and women from the families of the denomination. After we had eaten and drunk awhile, and the Royal family had been toasted, the Treasurer, Mr. Hornby, was complimented by the Chairman; Rev. Mr. Carpenter was, at the affectionate instance of Dr. Hutton, thanked for his excellent sermon; and Rev. E. Tagart's faithful services as Secretary of the Association were gratefully acknowledged. These gentlemen each favored the company with an address in reply. The well-known poet and member of Parliament, Dr. Bowring, next proposed as a sentiment, "The extension of all civil rights to the Jews," and eloquently advocated the same; after which, the worthy Chairman, in very considerate and kindly remarks, acknowledged feelings of fraternity towards the American Unitarians, and gave the following sentiment: —

"Our Brethren who form the Unitarian Churches in the United States of North America; with our warmest acknowledgments to them for their many powerful defences of our common faith, and for their liberal assistance to the cause of Unitarian Christianity in Canada."

At this moment no representative from America being found present but Rev. Mr. Simmons, he was called on to reply; which he did

by expressing on behalf of the churches here feelings of gratitude and filial love towards the brethren in England, and towards the English nation, and by holding forth the principle of liberty, and the motto of *unity in difference*, as that which was most worth contending for. He closed by wishing prosperity to the Association. The cheers with which this speaker was received as a delegate from America being very much increased by Mr. Tagart's then relating to the company what had happened to him in Mobile, he rose the second time, and said that there were two sides to the anti-slavery question in America, and many difficulties in determining the best way of acting, and that those preachers who were silent on the subject, acting from sincere conviction, often had to suffer in the opinion of others, as much as they who spake; and he then as representative, not of the American Abolitionists merely, but of all the American brethren, proposed as a sentiment, "The African race; the most oppressed, the most unresisting, and the most to be pitied of all." After the Stewards had received the thanks which they so richly deserved, this agreeable meeting separated. S.

Installations and Ordination. — Rev. Theodore Haskell Dorr, late of Billerica, was installed as Pastor of the Second Congregational Church and Society in Lexington, Mass., July 2, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, from 1 John iv. 14; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Dr. Field of Weston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Ware of West Cambridge; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Whitney of Brighton; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Muzzey of Cambridge, Frost of Concord, and Ripley of Waltham.

Rev. Jason Whitman, late of Portland, Me., was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Lexington, Mass., July 30, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H., from Revelation xxi. 5; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Right Hand of Fellowship was given by Rev. Mr. Muzzey of Cambridgeport; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Dorr of East Lexington, Thurston of Billerica, and Frost of Concord. The Charge, usually given on such an occasion, was omitted.

Rev. Oliver W. B. Peabody, of Boston, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Society in Burlington, Vt., August 14, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Peabody of Springfield, Mass., from 2 Timothy iii. 17; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Frothingham of Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Walker of Cambridge; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Cordner of Montreal; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Edward Turner, and Rev. Mr. Thompson of Salem.

*** Obituary articles, now in type, besides notices of books and articles of intelligence which we wished to give in the present number, are necessarily deferred.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

NOVEMBER, 1845.

Art. I.—A PLEA FOR THEOLOGY.

[An Address delivered before the "Association of the Alumni of the Cambridge Theological School," July 18, 1845. By Alvan Lamson, D. D.]

I hardly need say to you, Gentlemen, that the selection of a topic of address on an occasion and before an audience like the present, must necessarily be attended with no slight embarrassment. I am unwilling to take a mere abstract topic, or one which has no reference to the times. And yet of the times, and the religion and theology of the times it is a difficult and somewhat delicate matter to speak. A friend has suggested to me as a suitable subject, 'The Decline or Neglect of Thorough and Accurate Scholarship in the Ministry.' But this takes for granted what possibly some may think requires proof, and I do not like this looking round for defects. Yet I am desirous of saying something on the subject of theological studies, and something, if possible, which may help to a right estimate of them, and I have therefore chosen for my theme the Importance of Theological Science and Thorough Scholarship in the Ministry, at the present day. In other words, I would utter a Plea for Theology, embracing, as I here use the term, not simply Biblical literature, criticism and interpretation, but the nature, source, foundation and sys-

tematic arrangement of religious truths generally, whether derived from reason and the facts of consciousness, or from positive revelation.

Religion in its more practical aspects, especially as connected with the philanthropic movements and various social reforms of the day, is discussed elsewhere. It is discussed in our conferences and conventions, particularly during the anniversary week, in the neighboring metropolis, where the tribes meet, and our own little tribe among the rest, and many an animating word is uttered and the holy fire is rekindled on the altar of many hearts. A somewhat different atmosphere here breathes around us. We come back to the halls of science, to the fountains whence we drank in our earlier days, ere we had gone out on life's hot, dusty way. We come to greet our young friends, the teachers and theologians of the coming day. Theology surely may here claim a little thought. The times, if I mistake not, are pointing to it. They are interrogating us of theology, as well as of religion, and the questions, what is the worth of theology, and what good comes from it, what has it ever done for the world, or can do, and what do we, our denomination in particular, want of theology, or of theologians, — questions some of them often asked, and at times deridingly, or with scorn, — have a deep significance in themselves and a still deeper from their connexion with several of the problems of the age. A plea for theology then — the claims of theology, and the neglect of it and its remedy — this is my theme. I am not about to speak to or for any party, sect, or division of a sect. I wish, if possible, to take my stand outside of all of them. I wish to speak for theology in its largest sense, as a science, the study of which all are interested in promoting, not of any particular theology, or set of doctrines or opinions, about which I do not feel the utmost anxiety, because I believe that if these are wrong, the error, if the right course be pursued, will finally vanish. Theology, though it may occasionally find itself in a false position, will, if it be fairly treated, in the end right itself, and Christianity will go on its way. I shall speak with all plainness, relying on your candor to excuse my defects, and put a kind construction on my language.

Let me begin by saying a few words on the neglect of

theology, or indifference to it, supposed or real, in our denomination. I said that I do not like to look around for defects, nor would I lend a too credulous ear to the expressions of discontent or complaint which are occasionally heard. They may be but idle breath, mere murmurs of the summer wind. But they may be something more. There *does* seem to be in many minds a dissatisfaction with the present state of theology among us, and possibly there may be some ground for it. The want of a scientific theology, or a more thorough treatment of critical and theological questions than has been common with us of late, is beginning, it is said, to be extensively felt. The complaint has come, and still comes to us, that critical and theological studies are little respected among us, and a regard for them needs to be revived; that theological learning is fast dying out; that our sermons do not contain a sufficiently full and explicit statement of doctrines and the philosophical grounds of them, to satisfy the demands of the age; that the theology embraced in them is meagre, superficial, unsatisfactory. Our devotion to aesthetic culture, it is sometimes insinuated, has been too exclusive. We are accused of favoring a sort of devout sentimentalism, beautiful as summer clouds, but as unsubstantial, rather than dealing with the bone and sinew of great truths and principles. And again, we are either coldly ethical, we are told, or else in our eagerness to do justice to the religious element of the soul, we neglect the reasoning faculty, and view religion too exclusively on the side of the feelings and too little on the side of the intellect. At all events, it is said, that theology is not honored nor pursued among us to the extent it should be; that too few of our divines, however meritorious in other respects, are theologians. The tendency of the age, we are told, is to depreciate scholarship, and especially theological scholarship, understood to mean not the mere husk and shell of traditionary learning, which is not entitled to respect, but the best results of profound study and research.

Such is the complaint. Now there may be in a portion of these charges some slight admixture of truth, enough, at least, to give them an air of plausibility, and entitle them to attention. I am by no means sure that as a denomination we *have*, especially of late, been just to the

claims of a living, scientific theology. Certainly there are some facts or appearances, which have either operated to the discouragement of theological studies, or which may be construed into symptoms of their neglect and decline, or both.

Nor can I think that this is altogether the fault of the religious teachers themselves. The present depressed condition of theology among us certainly is not to be attributed wholly to them. They have done what the times required. They have been pastors to their flocks. Viewed as a class, too, I suppose it will be conceded, that there has appeared among them a fair proportion of acute, discriminating, and effective preachers; able discoursers on high themes of duty and consolation; men of fresh, vigorous minds uttering living truths from their own full hearts; men, too, some of them, of affluent thought, uniting the best treasures of ethical wisdom with refined intellectual culture; men of piety; spiritual men, kindling with faith and love and transfusing them into the souls of their hearers. And all these have been needed. Our preachers have done the work of their times, and they will do it still, the younger of them making themselves, as I have full faith that they will, what the times demand. If they have not, in general, become theologians in the strict sense of the term, it is partly because time and opportunity have been wanting, and partly because there has been no call for theology. The weekly round of a minister's labors, if those labors are performed faithfully according to the ideas of pastoral duty and preaching now prevalent among us, proves sufficiently exhausting to most constitutions. Then the means of prosecuting theological studies beyond the very narrowest limits are wanting in our denomination. From a multitude of causes, some of them growing out of the general tendencies of the age, and affecting literature as well as theology, and some of them peculiar to our own country, and connected with the nature of our civil institutions, with the character of social life among us, or with our sentiments and tastes as a sect, the provision which is made for theology among us, is of the slenderest kind. We have no endowments, or next to none, to aid us in the study of it; and no libraries containing ample records of the thoughts of other minds and collected stores of learned research.

Not only are the means denied, but it has been long felt, I believe, that little encouragement *has* been afforded in our denomination to the prosecution of the higher studies in theology. In truth there has been, or has seemed to be, an indifference to theology. There has been no demand for theology in the pulpit or elsewhere. Theology has not been asked for nor prized; and when pursued, it has been pursued for its own sake, and from a principle of pure love and reverence; and the study of it has been abandoned to a great extent by those who by mental constitution or taste were predisposed to engage in it. Some, who had started perhaps with high hopes, going forth in all the ardor of youthful enthusiasm, with hearts full of courage and trust, who had thought to penetrate into the inner temple of the sacred science, have proceeded a little way, and looking sadly round on the cheerless prospect, have paused and hesitated, and finally turned back, or diverged into more trodden or more inviting paths. If they have retained their profession, they have removed from their shelves their tomes of theology to make room for something which would avail them more. And why should they not? If old Jerome or Origen could be exchanged for a few piquant volumes of some popular novelist of the day, or half a library of the fathers be sold for a sum that would procure an edition of Carlyle, a good bargain, so far as immediate success in one's profession was concerned, certainly offered itself. Books treating worthily of the critical and higher theology cannot be published among us except by men of fortune. No bookseller is now simple enough to take the hazard of publication. A political pamphlet, a third or fourth rate novel, or a translation or reprint of the most flimsy production of the European press, a well written work of history, or a volume of crude, coarse, sectarian divinity will sell, but how few buy, or want, or care for a really profound work on theology, and especially Unitarian theology! It requires years to get off even a moderate edition of such a work, if disposed of at all.

Perhaps the necessity of critical studies has been less sensibly felt among us from the predominance of the element of common sense in our theology. The Unitarian theology has claimed to be, by eminence, the theology of common sense. It undoubtedly is so, and this is one of

its merits. Common sense is an excellent thing both in metaphysics and theology, and a few grains of it are worth more than all scholastic refinements and subtleties. Yet the disposition to refer everything to obvious laws and the mere common sense judgments of men, tends certainly to dwarf science, to damp the ardor of critical inquiries, and produce empiricism, whether in metaphysics or theology. This empiricism Unitarianism may have escaped by the general high intellectual culture of those who have embraced it, still if the disposition referred to has had the effect of insensibly diminishing a feeling of the necessity of a thorough, deep, and learned theology, the result need be no matter of surprise.

Another cause may have operated incidentally in producing a similar effect. It is a question of some interest and importance, what influence has hitherto been exerted, and what is to be exerted in future, by the introduction among us of what may be called a certain form or modification of transcendental truths and opinions. Of the final result I have no doubt, and I hesitate not to say, that I think it will prove decidedly beneficial. The movement which has taken place in the world of intellect, especially the attention bestowed on the higher philosophy within the last few years, and the stirring up of the still waters of theology, which has been the consequence, are in the end to elevate theology. They are to invest the subject with new interest, to infuse into it a new element of life. There was undoubtedly need of a more spiritual philosophy than was prevalent some years ago, though the defect in this particular has been much exaggerated, for the reality and importance of supersensual truths have never been extensively called in question among us. Still an impulse was needed, and it has been given, and good has already come of it, though not unmixed with evil. That the effect has hitherto been to narrow the range of theological studies and produce too great a contempt for the productions and experience of the past, I think, cannot be denied. There is no doubt in my mind but that the doctrine of 'intuitions,' 'universal inspiration,' 'instinctive convictions,' 'impulsiveness,' 'spontaneity,' well founded and important as it is, has yet, by the use which has been made of it, or the misapprehensions connected with it, done something

to lower the estimate of true scholarship, and discourage patient inquiry and thought. It has introduced, I must say, as it seems to me, a narrow, and in some respects a false principle of judging in matters pertaining to thought and intellect, and been the occasion of some shallow and flippant criticism. It has led to the conclusion, on the part of some, that study is a useless "weariness of the flesh." All useful truth, at least all spiritual truth, is spontaneous, and cannot be learned; and books, those storehouses which contain the treasures of the past thoughts and past experience of the race, have been spoken of with a lightness not altogether deserved.

I am not expressing a doubt of the reality of intuitive truths. I fully believe and always have believed in them. It is only an abuse of the doctrine of instinctive convictions and impulses to which I refer. Many of those who have talked against books, have made as much use of them as others, and, in truth, have derived their highest inspirations from them; they have used them to stimulate thought, but it has been different with their imitators and disciples, who have taken some of their expressions too literally, or misconceived their import. I cannot but think that the state of feeling, the mental habitudes and tastes to which I refer, have produced an effect unfriendly to that unremitted study and wide research, without which we must have either a superficial theology, or a theology deformed by many errors. Yet I have no fear for the future. What has happened will do us good, if we make a right use of it. We have been sent, as some have complained, to learn theology, as well as aethetics, of divine youths and maidens, — pleasant teachers enough, — and no doubt they have taught us some things worth remembering, though their Delphic utterances have occasionally confounded the mighty, and proved enigmas to the wise; and many crudities have been poured out upon the public, which a larger acquaintance with the history of opinions and processes of thought in other minds, in ancient and modern times, might have prevented. The evil, however, is but temporary, the good, I trust, permanent.

One thing is clear, — we must have theological scholarship. We must have a living, active, scholarlike theology; and theologians in the highest sense of the term. We can-

not long do without them. I shall not consume time in the attempt to exhibit the dignity of theology in itself considered. I shall proceed on no such abstract ground, though something, I think, might be plausibly said for theology in this connexion even. Viewed in its relation to absolute truth, though from the abstruse nature of some of the subjects about which it is conversant, it can never form an attractive study, it might be difficult to prove, except upon the lowest utilitarian hypothesis, that it is not entitled to some regard. It might not be easy to show that inquiries which of old, from the remotest period of antiquity, from the time when men first began to reason and think, awakened the curiosity of the human mind, and which have engaged the attention of some of the sublimest intellects the world has ever known, are unworthy of serious thought. We are accustomed to say that all truth is valuable. Yea, the divinest thing in the universe, if we except virtue, is truth. And why should the truths of theology, regarded as abstract truths even, be excluded from the range of topics suited to occupy the reflections of a liberal mind? But on this I do not insist. I am willing to place theology on the ground of a rational utility, and let her abide the test. When it is asked tauntingly, your heavenly goddess, what does she? What is she but a distant divinity, sitting on her misty throne in the clouds, receiving, it may be, the homage of speculative intellects, but doing nothing for humanity?— I reply, she is much more than this, and thus to exalt her on a barren throne, deck it as we may, is to do her great injustice.

First, let us view theology in its relation to the wants of the individual mind. There are questions which are continually rising, which belong to no age, but of which the minds of every age, as soon as they begin to exercise thought on the subject of religion, ask a solution, and a solution must have before they can attain to a state of full satisfaction and rest. Is it not so? First comes the unquestioning faith of childhood. The religious sentiment is active, and beautiful indeed are some of its manifestations. The period of doubt has not yet arrived. That waits the development of the intellect, for all skepticism is of the intellect. But the time of thought is reached; the mind, at least, if it possess a certain degree of inherent activity,

begins to reason; objections start up, strange problems present themselves, and the faith of childhood is reviewed. Religion must now be contemplated in its relation to the intellect as it has been before in its relation to the feelings, or rather has existed as a sentiment or feeling disconnected with all the subtler processes of the reflective powers. Can any one who thinks at all, avoid, one time or another, thus looking at religion and the doctrines of religion, yes, and the commonest doctrines too, those relating to God, Jesus Christ, sin, repentance, reconciliation, forgiveness, human immortality, in their connexion with reason, and the individual reason? That is, religion passes from the region of feeling or sentiment into the region of ideas, thought, knowledge. And here we arrive at theology, and we must now take her to our side.

I do not forget the distinction between theology and religion. I insist upon it. Still I say that religion cannot separate itself from theology and yet satisfy the wants of the individual mind, which sooner or later begins to question, and demands harmony between the feelings, blind faiths, and instincts, — and the intellect. Theology views religion on the side of the intellect. This is its special province. It subjects feelings and faiths to analysis; it states, it explains; it looks difficulties in the face, and solves them as it best can. True there are some difficulties it cannot solve, and therefore it is ever modest. It deals with truths which run up into the unknown and infinite. It must occasionally enter the obscure region of metaphysics, and must sometimes find itself at the utmost boundary to which human thought in its highest efforts of abstraction can ever penetrate, — where light and darkness blend and knowledge vanishes into uncertainty, and nothing is left for it but to bow and adore, and wait the revelations of the "great teacher, Death." We have as yet no "Intellectual system" of the universe, which explains all the enigmas of spiritual life, nor shall soon have. Still theology is expected to do, and it does, something. It does satisfy many wants of the mind. It furnishes a basis of doctrines, or truths, in which it can rest, and which are necessary not more to present contentment and comfort than to stability of faith, and in truth to all settledness in religion, all security amid the ebbs and flows, the thousand currents and counter-currents of ever varying opinions.

The disparagement sometimes thrown on theology by sincere and well-meaning, and in some respects intelligent minds, is undeserved. Why not make men good, religious, pure, holy, benevolent, it is asked, and let theology alone? The reply is, you cannot, if you would, stifle human thought; you cannot put the intellect to sleep. Command it to be silent, it will not obey you. Men will think and reason about religion, do and say what we will. And why should they not? These high themes — is not the intellect to be brought to bear on them? Should it not be? Can one, should one wish to pronounce a divorce between reason and religion, — or say that to carry reason, thought, inquiry into religion is impious? Then would there be nothing for the theologian to do. This would indeed be to "make a solitude" and "call it peace." As long as there is thought there must be theology. The intellect, if exerted at all, will put interrogatories, and these interrogatories must be answered. Some science of religion, some intellectual statement of religious truth, some theory or system, some philosophy of belief, in a word, some theology, men must and will have, and if they do not receive it from sound theologians, they will accept it from pretenders and empirics.

I have spoken of theology in its relation to the wants of the individual mind, and does it not, according to the view which has been taken, really appear to be something necessary and useful, something of which we must have either the reality or the counterfeit, the thing itself, or something which has the look and show of it. Which is better I need not say.

Again, theology has relations to human science and the general advance of the intellect, which require that it should be active, thorough, and scholarly, and if it be not, the cause of religion will suffer. This topic I have not time fully to develop and I must content myself with stating, in as few words as possible, two or three facts and principles which to me appear obvious and indisputable. I cannot go into the question, nor is it necessary to my present purpose, of the alleged skeptical tendencies of modern research and discovery. It may happen that the theology or doctrinal expositions of an age and its principles of biblical interpretation are at war with established

facts of science. There is nothing singular or new in this, and nothing alarming if the friends of religion are wise and understand their position, and are true to it. The popular theology has from the first, as successive new steps have been taken by science, frequently appeared at variance with the recently ascertained fact or law, and apprehensions have at times been felt lest the whole edifice of revelation should totter and fall. And what has been the course pursued and what the result? Well meaning, but mistaken friends of religion have undertaken to impugn the facts of science. But this course has always proved perilous, in the highest degree, to the cause of revelation. For however it may have succeeded for a time and with minds trained up amid a certain set of religious influences, the principles of reason and of our common nature have ever compelled, and will compel, the human mind at length to bow to the laws of science. Theology therefore, at the epochs to which I refer, the epochs of great discoveries, has found it necessary to re-examine its dogmas, and has successively abandoned positions which it could no longer retain without assuming an attitude of direct hostility to knowledge. The result has hitherto been that it has not found the fortress of Christianity shaken. It has only been forced to surrender some insignificant outposts, which it had injudiciously, or from ignorance or mistake occupied; it has called back its troops on discovering its error, and the tumults of war have ceased, the dust and smoke have cleared away, and the banner of the cross has been seen still floating securely over the rock-built citadel.

I need only allude in illustration to the times of Galileo. The conclusion to which he arrived, by a process strictly scientific, relating to the earth's motion, was denounced by the mistaken religionists and by many of the theologians of the day as false and contrary to the Scriptures. But the earth *did* move, notwithstanding. The fact was clear. And what did the theologians, or the church do in the end? They re-examined their theology, along with the popular notions and principles of Biblical interpretation and criticism on which it was founded, and they saw their error. The Bible, it was found, was meant to teach not science but religion — to reform not astronomy, but the human heart. In regard to physical phenomena it used the popular

phraseology founded on the appearance of natural objects to the senses. It was not necessary that it should adopt any other. It was concerned with spiritual truth alone—with man's relations as a moral and accountable being, with his affections, his consolation, and hope, in a word, with religion and morality. It might safely leave the physical laws of the universe gradually to unfold themselves to the growing and expanding intellect of the race.

Other and similar crises come, and will come. Take the simple illustrations of geology and astronomy. What strange revelations have they made within a recent period, and what revolutions have they brought about in men's opinions on some often most important elevated of subjects. Geology is penetrating the crust of the earth, and bringing up her newly discovered relics, and placing them before us, she relates to our wondering ears tales more marvellous than poets ever sung, tales of growth and decay and mighty revolutions at indefinitely remote periods. She is reading us a new chapter in the history of the globe we inhabit. While Geology is doing this, her star-crowned sister is piercing the glorious heavens, resolving nebular light, and from the hitherto fathomless depths of ether summoning into being new suns and new firmaments. And what is theology to do now? What does its relation to human science demand of it? Theology cannot remain silent, sitting solitary and voiceless in her ancient time-stained temple, like a dead idol, while all this din and noise of discovery are going on without. We must have a living, and not a dead theology, a mere petrifaction of the past. We must have a living theology that from age to age can define great and essential principles and truths, and separate them from the rubbish which men have gathered around them, and have mistaken for parts of those truths themselves. Religion must ever go side by side with science, and it belongs to theology to show how she can retain her position, nor be discrowned, but convert her rival into her servant and worshipper.

What is theology to do, is it asked? It must do what it has done before. It must review its teachings, its laws of criticism, its theories of the character, design and meaning of those venerable books so hallowed to our memories and so dear to our hearts that we cannot speak of them, nor

patiently hear them spoken of, with levity, which yet we may not fully understand. The result we need not fear. Theology, I am persuaded, is capable of reforming itself, and putting itself in harmony with science without sacrificing one great living truth of the Gospel.

This at least is certain, — there is but one way of counteracting what are called the skeptical tendencies of modern science, which is to show that the *real* results of scientific discovery do not conflict with any of the great essential truths of religion, and to this purpose, if need be, after the example of former ages, reform and modify the existing theology. Amid the advances continually made in the natural and speculative sciences, religion in its intellectual aspects or relations must not be allowed to fall behind the age; must not remain in the rear of human thought, or it will come to be regarded as an outworn and obsolete institution, and as the world's current sweeps on, will be passed by as a stranded bark on the shores of time.*

I have said more than I originally intended, though less than the subject seems to demand, on theology considered in its relation to human science. And now will any one, contemplating this relation, say that we have no need of a wise, enlightened and comprehensive theology? Must not theology, as I said, from time to time explain herself?

* A single example will illustrate my meaning. Will the world much longer endure a theology which teaches that all the deformity visible in nature, all the physical derangements and marks of violence exhibited by the crust of our globe, are to be referred to the introduction of sin into the world? I suppose that few of us will hesitate to say that a theology of which such a theory forms a part, is opposed to the truths of science, certainly as at present understood and seemingly well established. It is the theology of a former age, it does not belong to the present; it is as much out of place now as was the theology which taught that the earth is at rest, after Galileo had said, aside at the confessional, stamping his foot on the earth, "she does move though." That the disturbing forces alluded to were in existence and many of the effects wrought by them, indicating great convulsions in the surface of our planet, took place before men appeared upon it and sinned, is, I take it, not now to be classed among hypotheses, but among the indisputable facts of science. Theology then must explain itself in consistency with these facts, or the intellect of the race will range itself on the side of infidelity.

The theologian, however, will carefully distinguish between established facts of science and mere opinions. Thus the "nebular hypothesis," as it is called, of the origin of worlds, with which the author of "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation" starts, and the credit of which is due, I believe, to La Place, cannot as yet be classed with the established facts, but is only an ingenious conjecture of science, and were it established, it does not necessarily preclude an intelligent Creator.

Must she not take religion with her into the region of thought, of ideas, the region of science, and show that this daughter of the skies can walk there unharmed, yea, can sit a crowned queen in the very temple of science itself?

From the speculative and inductive sciences turn your eye for a single moment to the province of historical research. Historical inquiries are now conducted on principles which claim to be more scientific than those which guided the older authors whom we tasted in our youth. And what has been the result? A large amount of skepticism, no doubt, as the Niebuhrs and others will tell us. And has not this skepticism penetrated the domain of Christian history, and the Christian records themselves? And do we not need theologians who shall explain the origin and character of that skepticism, and taking their stand in Christian antiquity and gathering around them all the mouldering remains and obscure faiths and literatures of those distant times, shall tell us where and how far we have been deceived, if we have been deceived. It is said that historical skepticism has reached its extreme point of vibration and the pendulum now begins to swing in the opposite direction. However this may be, as the laws of historical belief have undergone a re-examination in recent times, theology, in one of its departments, must be prepared to reply to the question how far the Christian evidences are affected by the light, or the pretended light, which has broken in upon the path of history; what conclusions are shaken and what remain firm; how far the spirit of doubt and disbelief may go, and where truth and all the laws of evidence compel it to stop.

There is another relation of theology which makes the study of it both an imperative duty and a necessity, which the public is beginning to see, though, as it seems to me, without a distinct perception of what is to be done to encourage such study, — it is the relation it sustains to the *religious* questions and problems of the age. Several of these questions have come up within the few years last past, and some of them have important practical bearings. I have already alluded to the subject of historical testimony. I now refer more particularly to questions connected with what is termed the spiritual philosophy of the day.

What constitutes the appropriate evidence of religious truths? What is the legitimate province of intuition, and how far do the intuitions of consciousness really conduct us in religion, and where do they fail us? What are entitled to be considered first or instinctive truths, and how many such truths are there? Is the soul's immortality one of them? And what, after all, are the laws of human belief? Do modern discoveries, or progress in the higher philosophy, render miracles less credible or less needed than in former times? Whence has arisen the disposition of late to call in question their reality and value? — Human inspiration, of which so much is said, — in its last analysis, what is it? Is it anything more than has been always recognized under the different names of the light of reason, or light of nature, the natural teachings of the human intellect? Is it special or general, and what are its laws? These, and I mention them only as specimens, are questions, which, with a multitude of others, belong to theology in its broadest sense and which theology must settle. They occasion perplexity to many minds probably as much from want of precise ideas, and a clear definition of terms as from anything else. But whether this be so or not, they are questions which the theology of the age must maturely consider, and if they are simply old questions and old difficulties called up from the forgotton past, and clothed in a new dress, it must say so, and show it, and it must point out the path which true modesty requires us to tread in regard to belief or unbelief.

What has been said of theology as it regards the results of historical inquiry, and the discoveries of modern science, may be said of it in its connexion with the religious questions founded on what is denominated the spiritual philosophy of the day. That is, it must not remain silent. It must examine this philosophy, and show how much of it is true and how much a mere fallacy, and it must define its position.

A similar remark may be made respecting critical theology. New results are possibly obtained, or at least, it will be contended that they have been. After a period during which some advances have been made, and the laws of a severe criticism have been applied to the literature and records of a religion, theologians may find it necessary

to pause and look around them, and ask, to what has all this tended? Have any new results been obtained? Have any of the old foundations been really shaken? Have any parts of our theology become outworn or obsolete? Has the age outgrown them? Are there any old forms which require to be laid aside? Are there portions of the old edifice which time and labor prove to be weak, or to rest on an insecure basis? To what do these alleged improvements in theology really amount? Have they any solid substance, or are they only the bright reflection of clouds that must soon vanish from the sight?

I must pass over some topics on which I intended to speak,* and proceed to say a few words on what constitutes the fond dream of so many,—a stationary theology. A stationary theology in the strict sense of the term we cannot have, and should not desire, for it must be a dead theology. What does history teach on this subject? That theology is something which is fixed and does not change from age to age, and which once explained is explained forever? No. It teaches that theology never has been stationary, unless perhaps for short intervals during the profound slumber of the human intellect. If rest from doubt, if perfect repose is established conclusions, if an unchanging theology were anywhere to be found, we should naturally look for it in the Catholic Church. But do we find it there? There is no theological statement of any doctrine made by one generation which has been accepted by the next. The opinions of the early fathers were found defective by the fathers of a later age. What more unlike than the theology of Origen and Augustine? And the age of the scholastics surely exhibits no evidence of repose and unanimity in theological opinion. Have we not an Abelard and a holy Bernard manfully doing battle with each other; Thomists and Scotists, and a multitude of other combatants looking grimly down through the mists of time, their heavy tomes, with their "dark and ribbed backs" and "yellow leaves" belonging indeed "no more to man, but to the worm, the moth and the spider," yet the repository of thoughts which agitated the age, and

* A few passages omitted in the delivery of the address I have retained in printing, but others I am still compelled to omit by the limits to which it is necessary to confine an article in the *Examiner*.

through which intellect and theology purified and elevated themselves? Nay, many controversies and opinions deemed modern, date back to those ages of hard, obscure thought. Fenelon, and Bossuet, and Clarke, and Paley, and Kant, the Pantheists and Mystics of recent times, all have their prototypes there. Theology has never been at repose in the Catholic Church, and of the Protestant world I need not speak. It has never been at repose, and never can be; for theology, I repeat, dwells in the region of ideas and thought; it views religion in its relation to the intellect, and in its connexion with the philosophy of the age, and to speak of any rest in theology is to suppose human thought to be arrested in its course, to become motionless and fixed in crystalline forms. The intellectual character, modes of thinking and maxims of a particular age, must of necessity affect the theology and theological conceptions of that age. Men will look out upon theology or religion from different stand-points; they will judge it with reference to prevailing ideas and philosophical theories. Of course there can be, properly speaking, no unchanging theology. Theology can never wear the same garb in different ages, and there will always be work for theologians, the thinkers and the expounders, to do.

Much is said about the historical element of theology, and the parties diverge and go wide of each other. I am the advocate of a historical theology, but not of a mere historical theology, that is, mere formulas of thought transmitted from the dead past. That must be a thing without life — a body without a soul. Theology must have a principle of life, — it must be an animated, breathing thing, — it must have a soul. If it be the mere dry rind of former opinions, an outworn garment of past thought, the sooner it is cast aside the better, for it is a useless encumbrance, or worse, since it stands in the way of something better. It cannot be a mere historical theology. But then, on the other hand, it cannot cut itself away from the past, nor discourage learned research into it. It can no more dispense with the knowledge of Christian history and antiquity, that is, of the religious experience of the past, than with biblical literature, philology and criticism. A doctrine or principle can never be so well understood in itself and in its

applications, as when it is traced back to its origin, — its first elements, — and is thence followed down through its various modifications and changes, and the influences by which they were wrought, till it received its present form and character.

To discard the historical element of theology, to suppose that we can have a theology of to-day, which has no connexion with the theology of by-gone time, but has a Minerva birth in the brain of this generation, does not, as it seems to me, argue either depth of thought or wisdom. There are certain landmarks fixed in the past — as Christians, certainly, we must suppose that there are, — which may be of use in guiding us on our way. To turn away our eyes and say we will not look at them, is one extreme, as a superstitious veneration for whatever is covered with the dust of antiquity is another. There is an excessive reverence for antiquity we all know, and this bowing implicitly to the authority of the early fathers, this talking of them as superior beings almost, a race of demi-gods, when we have evidence that they had little exactness, were careless observers, and worse reasoners and critics, that they came into the Christian fold tainted with the errors of a false and absurd philosophy, — too absurd, seemingly, looking at it from our present position, for human belief in the most credulous age, — may well move our indignation or provoke our smile. And did we need theologians acquainted with the old for nothing else, did we not need them to help to explain our own theology, and collect the scattered rays of light which dimly shine through the darkness of the past, we should need them to show that antiquity is not what many deem it, that it affords no foundation for the fabric they erect, and which they tell us is the only safe mansion to dwell in. We should need them to drive out the bats and owls, and all deformed birds of night, which still infest the regions of theology. The past will be used by others, the Romanist, the Puseyite, the retainer of the Athanasian and Augustinian theology; and we are compelled to combat them in part by weapons drawn from the same armory, because there are a multitude of minds which are determined, or at least greatly influenced by authority, prescription, antiquity, councils and fathers.

With criticism and interpretation conducted on rational and scientific principles, there must be united history, which gives us the results of the thoughts of all past ages, so far as they have been employed on religious subjects, an aid with which we cannot dispense, if we have a theology at all. And there is but one way of proceeding without a theology, and that is to divorce religion from the intellect, — to assign it a distinct and independent province, — to say that we will leave the religious sentiment to take care of itself; and then we know that it will at times run into the wildest vagaries; it will put out an excrescence, or exhibit a deformity here and another there; it will fall under the lead of quacks and empirics, and there is no extravagance, the offspring of human credulity and folly, or fanaticism, so absurd, but it will be found advocating it. And this certainly our denomination will not endure or never long. It will never be content to rest in a religion which is one of mere impulse and sentiment, in which the mystical element is made everything and the rational element allowed no place. As little will it be satisfied with the exercise of thought in looking at religion in its merely ethical aspect. This aspect is important, and ethical discourses cannot be abandoned; but the ethics of the pulpit, if they be not altogether cold and superficial, must of necessity run up into theology, from which they derive both light and warmth.

Every sect or class of Christians must have a living, scientific theology, and we must continue to have one. It is not the policy of any sect to neglect theology; and it is not true to itself, and must insensibly dwindle and crumble away, if it do. It loses its cohesive power: it cannot satisfy inquiring minds: it cannot reply to the questions of the age: it is ill prepared to resist pressure from without, and having no central point of attraction, there will be a continual divergence of minds going off in every direction to other sects.

After all, the standing and permanency of a denomination are determined, more than many are aware, by its theology. By the depth of its researches, its learning, its original and profound criticism, its exposition and defence of great truths, by the thorough and scholarly articles of its reviews, by the treatises it sends forth, of a character to

stir the deep fountains of thought in the community, it commands the respect of other sects and of the world.*

I know that there are other qualities which give to sects prosperity and extension, at least for a time, as great ardor of feeling, an exciting style of address, missionary zeal, and whatever appeals powerfully to the imagination or the sensiblity, and especially to the religious or mystical element of the soul. But many of these sects speedily melt away and become extinct, or if they survive they soon begin to turn an eye of favor on theology. There is no surer token that a sect is elevating itself and acquiring importance than the attention it bestows on critical and theological science and the facilities it furnishes for its attainment; and when a denomination which has heretofore taken the lead in these, begin, in the world's opinion, to occupy a subordinate place, its comparative weight and influence among the sects are on the decline. Whatever be its aesthetic or mere literary culture, or its ethics, it soon comes to be visible that in what constitutes the muscle and nerve of a denomination it is deficient, and if it would regain what it has lost, it must return to severer forms of thought and higher studies. It must foster theology in the widest sense of the term.

And has our denomination, I would ask, in conclusion, for the last few years, been doing, and is it now doing, what it should for theology? It may feel in part what it has owed and must owe to its theologians, but is it doing what it ought to rear them? I alluded, near the commencement of this address, to the little encouragement which has seemed to be afforded to the prosecution of the higher studies in theology among us, and the difficulties to be encountered by the student. I will conclude with a slight reference to the history of our theological School, the neglected child of the denomination. Our community is a liberal one, but its liberality does not flow copiously in this channel. Whether from dread of sectarianism, from ten-

* The Polish Brethren were great neither in wealth nor numbers, but by the largeness of their views, the acuteness and force of their criticisms, and stores of theological science, they secured a name and memory which have been denied to larger and more affluent sects, and their *Bibliotheca* still holds its place on the shelves of every well furnished theological library, and the germs of a large portion of the best modern criticism are found in its pages.

derness to old Alma Mater, who must be supposed to look somewhat askance on this reputed heretic member of her family, or from some other cause, the wants of the School, viewed as a nursery of theologians, have been scantily supplied, and I suppose that I am only uttering the common sentiment of those best qualified to judge on the subject, when I say that from no fault of those within it, whether teacher or pupil, but from the cause just stated, — the want of a proper interest on the part of the religious public, whose opinions it represents, — it is not occupying a position exactly which is worthy of the denomination, or corresponds to the enlarged ideas of its founders, or which the advance made by other sects, and the demands of the age render desirable.

Allow me to state two or three simple facts. Twenty-six years nearly have now passed away since the adoption of the "Constitution and Rules of the Theological Seminary in the University." By this instrument the "Theological Department, or Faculty of Theology in the University," as it is called, is made to consist of six Professors. Three of these, the Alford Professor of "Natural Religion and Moral Philosophy," then Professor Frisbie, the Hollis Professor of Divinity, and the "Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental languages," it is true, did not belong exclusively to the theological School, yet they had distinct duties assigned them in it, corresponding to the character of their several professorships. Besides these, three other professorships were erected, — one of "Sacred Literature," or the "Criticism and Interpretation of the Scriptures;" one of "Pastoral Theology," and one of "Sacred and Ecclesiastical History, including Jewish Antiquities and Church Order."* The first of these was filled immediately by the first Dexter Professor, the second was filled ten years afterwards, and the third, though it covers several of the great topics of the day, among which are "Historical Christianity," and the "Church,"—ground occupied by the Ro-

* The document from which I quote, — "Constitution and Rules of the Theological Seminary of the University in Cambridge," — will be found prefixed to Mr. Norton's Inaugural Discourse, on the "Intellectual acquisitions and endowments required to constitute a consummate theologian." It bears the signature of Dr. Kirkland, then President of the University, and is dated August, 1819.

manist, the Puseyite, and the disciples of Strauss,* — still, after the lapse of twenty-six years, remains vacant. Meanwhile, the Alford Professor has ceased to hold relations with the theological School, the College has no Divinity Professor, and the duties originally distributed among the whole six are now required to be performed by two, who have other duties assigned them in addition. Thus, after the expiration of more than a quarter of a century, not only have the noble and far-reaching views of the founders of the School not been carried into effect, but in the particulars just mentioned, the School has been retrograde.

During the period specified, theological inquiry and speculation have been active beyond former example, opinions have been brought into violent conflict in every part of Christendom, and sects around us have been rapidly advancing in the means of theological culture.†

This is not as it should be; not that we view with regret the progress made by other sects. We rejoice in the evidence of such progress which is spread before us. But we witness with pain the little comparatively, which is doing by our own to meet the growing demands of the times, and keep pace with our fellow believers, who differ from us in their exposition of Christian doctrines. We are unwilling that our denomination should fall behind in regard to a supply of the means of theological education and scholarly criticism. For the best public theological library, so far certainly as modern publications are concerned, we must now go beyond the boundaries of our denomination. If, in this respect, and in the value of their theological literature, other sects have made advances disproportionate to those of our own, the fact certainly should awaken

* Strauss can be completely answered only by one intimately acquainted with the writings of Christian antiquity. Some of the parts on which he is most vulnerable are those in which an appeal is made to those writings.

† The Theological Seminary at Andover has five professors, and two of our Episcopal Seminaries the same number. One of our Presbyterian Seminaries has six; the Theological Institution at Newton, and twelve of our other theological seminaries have each, three; six of them, four; Cambridge, with some nine or ten others, has only two. In Germany, ten or a dozen theological professors are not thought too many to be attached to a single institution. The University of Halle has eleven, that of Berlin thirteen. The thirty-eight theological seminaries in the United States have one hundred and five professors, giving an average of nearly three to each. Cambridge, therefore, falls below the average.

serious thought. It should lead to the inquiry, whether we are continuing true to our position and profession; whether, having given the impulse to critical studies, — for of metaphysical theology I do not now speak, — we ought to allow ourselves to be outstripped in any respect in the provision which is made for their thorough and successful prosecution.

One of the two great requisites to give an impulse to theological studies in our denomination, as it seems to me, is an extensive and well-chosen theological library, which will enable our theologians and critics to push their researches beyond the very narrow limits, which now confine them from want of books, for which they must at present send across the Atlantic, and which no private means can procure to the extent to which they are needed. The other is to put the theological School on something like the footing contemplated in 1819, but to which the poverty of the institution has hitherto been an insuperable obstacle. The effect would be not only to give to the institution additional claims to confidence and respect, but what is more, it would bring theology into repute by showing the determination of the denomination to honor and cherish it, and revive the prostrate or sinking hopes of the friends of the science. The augmented advantages and facilities the School would offer to a really thorough course of theological study would attract students to the spot, and the Professorial chairs, which must from time to time be filled from the ranks of the ministry, would excite the ambition of the younger portion of our religious teachers, whose tastes might lead them to select the walks of theology, and a new and brighter era would soon dawn. But this is not the time nor the place to enter into any discussions respecting the organization of the School, some of which are soon to take place elsewhere, nor are the friends of the institution and friends of theology, perhaps, as yet prepared to say what, under existing exigencies, can or should be done, however desirable some change in the external relations of the School, as well as some augmentation of its internal means, may appear.*

I have said something in reply to the question, of what

* The proposition to sever the Divinity School from the College is to be discussed in the Board of Overseers during its next winter sessions. If the separation takes place, a re-organization of the School, in part at

use are theology and theologians? Theologians, — is it still asked, what real influence do they exert, and what place do they occupy in the world's history? History itself must answer the question. The great names in the church, — names which have left a memory, which are still familiar as household words to the student of the past, — are the names of its theologians. Such were the old fathers, and such scattered along the track of eighteen hundred years have been all those whose lives have formed an epoch in the development of Christian doctrines. The theologians have been, to use Hallam's word, the "builders," erectors of mansions for others to dwell in. Who have so ruled the Christian world as Athanasius and Augustine, the theologians and thinkers? The only names which won immortality in the mediaeval ages are those of theologians, men of powerful intellect and subtle thought. And if we come down to a more recent period, Erasmus is no mean name in theology, and the influence he exerted over the mind of the age was greater than many imagine. Luther was compelled to invest himself with the armor of theological learning, such as he could hastily acquire, before he conquered. And were not Melancthon, and Zwingle, and Calvin theologians? These are they who have shaped men's opinions, — been "builders" of mansions. If we turn to a different quarter, what results were wrought by the liberal theologians of Holland! Grotius still shines a bright star in the upper sky, nor is Le Clerc forgotten. Such men as Descartes have not lived in vain for theology any more than for metaphysics. America has had her Edwards, and continental Europe her Leibnitz, her Spinoza, her Strauss and others, who have agitated or troubled the wells of theology, and have left, or will leave, footprints "on the sands of time." If some have done evil, and led the world astray, there is but the more need of others to bring it back from its wanderings. We must have men of strength and stature to war with the Titans.

What influence have theologians! The history of Christ-

---

least, will be necessary, for which the friends of Liberal Christianity should be prepared. It may be deprived of a portion of the funds, the proceeds of which it now enjoys; this loss must be, in some way, made up to it. The School must be sustained, and that it will be, no one who is acquainted with the disposition and resources of the denomination, can for a moment doubt.

ian doctrine in different ages of the church is but the history of the mind and thoughts of its theologians. They have developed and moulded it, and given it a voice, and through them it has passed into the popular belief. If their influence is not now what it once was, because modern intellect has opened to itself other fields of inquiry and labor, and theology no longer sits a divinity sole and absolute in the world, still is not their power wholly gone, and as the age is returning to the discussion of theological topics, there is a growing need of them, and the sect which would be just to itself, to its age, to mankind and to truth, must be just to theology.

Here I should close. But the passing away of an old and venerated teacher, and a faithful servant of Christ, demands one brief word of tribute before we part. Though the flame had been long burning dimly in its socket, and the late Hollis Professor had been for several years withdrawn, by age and infirmity, from his active labors, and in a great measure from the eye of the world, the tidings of his death cannot, I am sure, have been received by his former pupils without awakening many hallowed recollections. He was a teacher and theologian of other days, differing in some respects from those on which "we have fallen." But his preëminent merit, his wisdom, his clear-sightedness, his spotless integrity, his firmness, his single-hearted love of truth and right, the extent, too, as well as the accuracy of his theological learning, according to the standard of his country and time, none will deny. Cautious by temperament and upon principle, he yet led the way in liberal studies, and was one of those who "labored," and into whose labors we have "entered." The debt the world owes to such men is not always duly estimated, because the complexion of the times has changed; yet they were the foremost of their age, like time itself, it may be, to use Lord Bacon's phrase, "innovating greatly, but quietly and by degrees scarcely to be perceived," but nobly accomplishing the work Providence committed to their hands, and for what they were and what they did, to be holden in ever honored remembrance. Of Dr. Ware none will ever speak but with reverent thoughts and in reverent words. And he had worthy associates. What memories

rise up as we go back to the days when some among us were initiated into our theological course under the guiding genius of the genial, the acute and intellectual Kirkland, the copious and eloquent Frisbie, — with him whose ashes this present week have been deposited in the friendly tomb, — and him, the critic and theologian, whom, still in his prime, we yet retain.

Art. II. — THE FINE ARTS IN AMERICA.*

Among writers Goethe is eminently the Artist. It was in this character that he contemplated humanity. Through the medium and ministry of Art he seemed to perceive all the relations of life, how intimate they were, and how harmoniously they blend together. To unfold so important a truth as this — the harmony of the powers of human nature — is no ordinary task. It is worthy of the greatest mind of the age. And we regard with the deepest interest the diffusion of this idea among the American people and in this utilitarian age. At least it will help to a correct understanding of the useful, than which, at this period of our progress and amidst our present tendencies, no revelation is more important or necessary.

Mr. Ward has done a good service to the public as the translator of these Essays. We might say much more than this in the utmost sincerity, and still express our dissatisfaction with the book which he has here given us. It is far from being complete. To most readers it will appear fragmentary, and not unfrequently a discussion of any other principles than those of Art. This criticism will by no means apply to all the portions of the work. The Essay "upon the Laocoon" is singularly complete, not only as a critique upon that particular group, but as an illustration and application of the highest artistic principles.

But we have not taken up these "Essays" so much to discuss their practical merits, as to speak of the *promise* which their appearance before the American public seems

* *Essays on Art, by Goethe.* Translated by Samuel Gray Ward. Boston: Munroe & Co. 1845. 16mo. pp. 264.

to indicate. It is, that the thought and feeling of our community are taking a new direction. There is another spirit of the age besides the utilitarian; or perhaps we should speak more truly, if we said that the utilitarian spirit is seeking new and higher ends, — it is striving to blend itself with the beautiful. The translation of these essays, and the publication of such practical books as Downing's, we say, are signs of promise. They indicate something for the Fine Arts in America.

Even our utilitarianism, so often spoken of as a reproach, is not destitute of this promise. We begin to doubt that criticism to be either profound or true, which represents American character as exclusively favorable to the *useful* arts. That these have advanced with a wonderful rapidity, or that American genius has given them a new impulse, we do not deny. Only this fact may imply another. The truest as well as the largest idea of life is that which links together all the spheres of human activity, which detects a relation and a sympathy between all created things. In this light progress becomes a universal law, applying to all conditions of the world and all the elements of human nature. Hence we say, that the useful arts cannot advance without nearly a corresponding growth of the beautiful. Almost immediately do they blend together. Towards beauty all that is useful tends and strives. It is the high aim, the attractive point of life. This is true not less in life's common aspects than in its higher ones of sublimity and heroism. To become beautiful, and render what we do beautiful, is one of the chief anxieties of the human heart. In nature, which gives our law, all is useful and all is beautiful. There we find no dividing lines. It is one progress. There are indeed two elements, but one spirit strives in both. Thus our steam-vessels are more than useful; they ride our rivers with a graceful balance, like a dove in the air. The beauty of our naval architecture was a growth from the useful art. The fact, then, that the useful arts advance, is nothing against a people's refinement or taste. Rather it is so much gain, so much new acquisition, and is the sign of a farther and more general progress. What is accomplished in the useful is so much preparation for the beautiful. The growth of architecture illustrates the idea. First men built houses for convenience, but they

soon tired of mere shelters, and every improvement they made was an advance in the direction of beauty. Houses to eat and drink in are not quite satisfactory to a man. A place for thought he deems also necessary, and hence a beautiful house. Thus architecture grew to become one of the fine arts.

Therefore, because we are appropriating the useful arts to all the varieties of industry, our attention is not necessarily called off from the objects of beauty. What we gain in one department of life is so much gained for the whole. There is not so much conflict between the different callings of men as we are sometimes led to imagine. When pursued in their true spirit, they sustain, and never interfere with each other. They are mutual helps. The artist ought to have no rivalry with the mechanic. They each have a field great enough for all their energies, and ought to work in harmony and peace. The economy and progress of the world need both, — can dispense with neither. This point is worth considering. Rivalry and jealousies are the result of narrow and partial views; they hinder, but do not advance the interests of the world. Men ought to work from love, not from rivalry. Genius ought never to be cramped by limitations, or degraded by the inspiration of low motives. Give it freedom, give it elevation, render it impartial and expansive, if you desire to see great and worthy labors. The progress of the world depends much upon the harmony that prevades all its callings and all its members. When all work together with single aims and without conflict or discord, there must be advancement, for then no power is lost. There is mutual support then. No energies are neutralized by a war with each other. Thus the useful and beautiful arts have but one aim, and that is the growth and perfection of human life. Any jealousy between them will palsy their efforts — degrade the motives which ought to animate all true endeavor and inspire all true souls. Hence we do not look upon the utilitarian spirit of America as entirely to be regretted, but rather as a happy prophecy of future refinement. It has a noble and an encouraging aspect, and helps to account for the sudden and unexpected rise of the fine arts among us. The fine arts could hope but little from a people in whom the idea of the useful was but partially developed or understood.

The nature of our institutions is another influence that will, in some measure, account for the same thing. Freedom and enthusiasm usually go hand in hand. They cherish in a people the feeling of admiration and love. These elements, almost of necessity, combine to develop and encourage the sense of beauty. Directly from freedom we derive a promise of aesthetic culture and taste. It is the spring and source of beauty in the soul. We speak now of freedom as it appears in the nature of our institutions. Of its practical workings we have not much to say. As an element destined to shape the American character, it bears upon our present inquiry. More than anything else it is to distinguish us from the older nations of Europe. A single consideration will show the important relation that our freedom must sustain to the arts of design. These arts, it is said, and with truth, need patronage. Aristocratic countries have generally been most liberal toward the artist. Private wealth has been thought to be insufficient. Besides, it is supposed to be concentrated in the hands of those who are without refinement; the competition and struggle which must exist in a community where all are equal, are calculated to nourish any other feelings than those connected with taste and beauty. Neither of these positions is strictly true. With us wealth is quite equally distributed. It exists in nearly equal proportions among all classes and in all conditions. Men with taste and men without it are sometimes rich. The refined and the vulgar, the well-born and the low-born, very nearly, we imagine, divide the wealth of America. But in all spheres are found liberality and refinement. A grocer in New York and a bookseller in Philadelphia are known over the whole country as lovers and patrons of the fine arts. On the other hand, in countries where the arts have reached their highest perfection, instances are not wanting of distinguished and neglected genius. Distressing want has been no stranger to the artists of Italy or France. In the gallery at Dresden is a picture of Correggio, now one of the chief attractions there, which brought a price so inadequate to its worth as to occasion the deep and settled grief of the artist; and finally, from similar causes, disappointments became so heavy as to terminate his life. This is no solitary instance. But considering the youth of our country, and

the influences under which we have lived, unfavorable to refinement, the arts among us have received no common favor, and we have little reason to fear that American artists as meritorious as Correggio will ever die from neglect and want. We do not shrink from a comparison with far older nations. We give no unqualified commendation. We are only comparing the probability of patronage in an aristocratic and a free community, and in giving the judgment in favor of the latter we only state an inference which the very nature of freedom legitimately forces upon us.

Patronage, too, in a free community possesses a new and elevated character. Freedom does away with the degrading sense of dependence and obligation, when it is bestowed as a favor instead of being given as an equivalent. Benevolence, we know, loses its charm and virtue without the disinterested motive. The *free* gift is the sign of a true feeling in the giver. To patronize indigence is not benevolence. So of the patronage of art. Let it be spontaneous and free, prompted by the love of beauty. Otherwise it is poor encouragement. It fetters the receiver. He is made to feel too keenly the condition of dependence he is in. His genius becomes enfeebled — his work a task instead of a pleasure. It is done through necessity, and not wholly from love. Patronage, unless it leave the artist free, will crush rather than aid him. There has been patronage enough in England, but because of a false character, it has proved without success. The only field of the beautiful in which English art has become eminent, is that of Landscape Gardening. In this department it is without a rival, as it has been without patronage. It has been the growth of private enterprise and taste, and hence has been free. So peculiarly is freedom the atmosphere of the artist. He can breathe no other without becoming fettered and feeble. He is a sensitive being. None *feels* more intensely than the artist. A sense of dependence, and that he is degraded by it, will crush no other man so soon. Rough reproach or neglect he may be able to bear, yet not reflections upon his condition, not an air of assumption and superiority. So it has come, that patronage has been so often the degradation of art. The institutions under which we are living possess a new and happier character. They are based upon freedom, and their influence must tend in

that direction. Therefore we said that patronage in America was a new thing, and in a peculiar degree favorable to the growth of the beautiful arts. It in some measure accounts for their sudden and early rise among us. It leaves the artist unconstrained and free.

But these do not seem to be the principal causes of the rise of art in America. The chief cause, in our estimation, is to be found in the American character. This has not yet been recognized as among the prominent influences which bear the promise of our future refinement. We hear much said of our majestic rivers, and bold mountains, the traditions of an elder race, the beauty of our landscape scenery, forests, and prairies, and lakes. But these are only materials for genius. They do not of necessity inspire or create it. To a mind alive to the beautiful in nature or the poetry of the past, they are the objects and occasions of admiration. But in the mind itself must exist the capacity which admires or creates. Without the inward sense and perception of beauty all outward forms are nothing. Genius is needed to select beautiful aspects, for, after all, the mind must clothe and adorn them before they can be seen as either beauty or truth. No beautiful scenery — Alpine heights or Italian skies — can give birth to the artist. Genius depends upon the happy blending of the elements of character. Most men need to be educated. Few minds are developed spontaneously by the simple impulses of nature. Many a man hears Niagara, or looks out upon our prairies, unmoved. Few seize the idea they contain, receive it as a part of their lives and carry it with them forever. Of all those who travel to remarkable places how few catch any new inspiration! How many go from fashion, and how few from love! How many visit St. Peter's and the Strasburg Minster from curiosity or wonder, and how few from religion! How many enter the galleries of art merely to be pleased, and how few to be rapt and kindled and elevated by the spirit of beauty! Multitudes of the proud and rich, polite and learned men, build their homes beside beautiful rivers, in the centre of retired landscapes, on principles of the most approved taste, or wander among the splendid abodes of ancient art where every step brings up some new memory of genius, or devotion, or love, while no genius is excited, no devotion or love felt. But

far away from all scenes like these, unknown and in poverty, a young man rises up in the midst of common scenes and still more common men, of enthusiasm and a sensitive heart, of clear and native perception, whose soul is touched and thrills with every new sound and every new aspect of earth or sky, who feels in all he sees or hears a spirit kindred to his own. He is the artist, though the Vatican and Louvre have never been heard of by him, and his humble name never been uttered beyond the narrow circle where he toils and rejoices. Yes! the secret of art lies *within* the artist. Skies and mountains do not hold it. The spring and province of art lie in the character of the mind.

A further illustration will confirm the same truth. How little travellers *retain* of the beautiful scenes they visit! The reason is, that their impressions were not distinct or deep. The heart was unmoved, for what the heart discerns it retains. It never loses one of its treasures. It is not touched by influences so cold and superficial as curiosity and fashion. Love and religion alone move and control the heart. It does not criticise, — it feels. He who is *alive* to beauty, who truly sympathises with the spirit of art, never forgets; for in every new feeling, or sympathy, or impression, he is conscious of a new acquisition and a new growth, of being *more* than he was, and can never forget till unconscious of his own existence. He who is alive to beauty, if he find it upon the canvas or marble, or perceive it in the kind influences of nature, will carry with him whatever he may see or hear, and enjoy it in the remembrance not less than in the actual hearing and presence. Shut in such an one from the beautiful objects he loves so well, hills and running streams and forests, he is not therefore shut out from the realm of beauty. He bears the whole world of art within him, and lives on in a deep and ever increasing happiness. We here announce a universal truth. If the *impression* be lost the moment we lose sight of a landscape or a picture of art, we may be sure that no love of nature or art is within us. The skies of Italy were not made for us. Phidias, and Raphael, and Dante, and Beethoven did not live for us. If we forget a friend when he leaves our presence, or when he dies, we have felt no true affection. Whatever scenes we may visit, whatever friends may sur-

round us, if their memory be not present with us in our retirement, we can have perceived little beauty and felt little love. To such hearts nature has no voice, and in them friendship can excite no emotion. It must be, that the secret and spring of art lie within the mind. To possess any promise of excellence, the sentiment of beauty must be a prominent element of the individual or national character. Splendid scenery, great rivers, sunny and deep skies, cannot give it. Thus sculpture grew out of the Grecian heart, and did not, like the Ephesian Diana, fall down from Jupiter. The feeling and sensitive heart is the surest prophecy of genius.

We do not reject or undervalue the influences of natural beauty, or the study of ancient models. We only affirm our conviction, that these are not the certain promises of artistic excellence to any community, however favorably situated in all such respects. Greece is not now the cradle of art. The masters are no longer natives of Italy. Without the nicely strung and nervous temperament — a *sensitive* character — other agencies are given in vain. There is nothing on which they can act. Besides, the mind is very much the creator of its own beauty. Its own condition determines the character of the outward world. If cheerful and happy and pure, it will find beauty in all the forms of nature. If dark with sin, it will clothe the fairest scenes with the gloom of a dungeon. Beauty is an element of the heart. Without warm and deep feeling, intense emotions, a liveliness to joy or sorrow, there may be judgment, invention, strength, perseverance, greatness, but not the keen perception of beauty, not the promise of artistic excellence. The question now arises, does the American character possess these elements and contain this promise? It must be admitted, that the English people have never exhibited in any high or peculiar sense, a capacity for the fine or beautiful arts. They have great and sterling qualities, but the nice perception of beauty is not among them. For this reason they have never excelled in the more elevated walks of art. They stand unrivalled, as we have said, in landscape gardening and in a correct taste for rural scenery. But beyond this they have not gone. That they have produced fine paintings and eloquent specimens of statuary, we do not deny. That they have excelled in mu-

sic, we do not deny. We only give them a second place. England has had no masters, no distinct school of art. Irish character is far better fitted to the purposes and pursuits of the fine arts. Deep feeling, spontaneousness, enthusiasm, are Irish. Coldness, uniformity, patience, strength, judgment, are the elements of English greatness. Whatever of tragedy has been great in England, has been displayed not so much in the arts of design as in the more exclusive domain of thought, the drama. For this field the English character is peculiarly fitted. Here it can have time to consider and compare. It can think and wait and judge. But here *feeling* must be subordinate. It must yield to the more sober dictates of the reason. The head must rule the heart. We except Shakspeare. He is the glory, not the exponent of English genius. He is not national, but one of the prophets of humanity. He gave the rules of genius, and, of consequence, is not to be estimated by any local comparisons. Thought is the English characteristic. This does not make the artist. Imagination and feeling are the elements to form artistic character.

But to make up an accurate history of the elements that enter into the American character, the peculiarities of the Puritan deserve to be considered, for in both economical and moral characteristics we are the descendants of Puritan stock. Their hard virtues, their self-denying spirit, their uncompromising fidelity and rigid principles drove them from their homes and country, and planted them in the wilds of America. They were the sternest of the English name. With them the right had more attractions than beauty. Religion and conscience were the only names before which they bowed. Painting and statuary were connected in their minds with the idol worship of Rome, and they looked towards the arts with distrust, and almost with abhorrence. New England directly inherits the Puritan character. Indirectly, it has contributed largely to mould that of the whole country. In the church, Congregationalism was the Puritan's vindication of individual rights against the assumptions of a groundless authority. It was the assertion and the triumph of the individual conscience. It was no insignificant power, but the highest exhibition of the Republican spirit. Hence the result. The Congregational element in all denominations has greatly modified the char-

acter which they bear in the States of Europe. Even Romanism, entrenched as it is and guarded from innovation, has deeply felt, and been influenced by its spirit. For the most part the Puritan is an *unyielding* character. It is strong, active, with tendencies to virtue. In life we should expect to find it prompt and efficient, preferring rather to persevere than to change. It is a healthy and a stable character. But can it be expected to develop itself in the direction of beauty? Milton was both a Puritan and a poet. But the elements of life in him were peculiarly blended, and he is not to be taken as a fair or general illustration. To correctly answer our inquiry, we must contemplate the Puritan under other influences than those which gave him birth, and directed his earliest growth. In England he was no artist, and without the prospect of ever becoming one. This is the actual fact. He was too much engaged in conflict, too much engrossed in guarding his conscience amidst the trials of an overwhelming opposition, and from the seductions of a more fortunate Church, to bestow his attention upon the arts. Besides, they were associated in his mind with the corruptions of the Romish religion, and the pride and display of his own aristocratic rulers. No wonder that he looked upon them with distrust and rejected their claims.

Transplanted to another land, and placed under different influences, we find important changes working in the character of the Puritan. In some respects we witness a new development. Restraint and fear, which formerly held his best energies in check, are now removed. There is freedom, and, of consequence, increased activity and power. The governed has become the governor. New scenes are opened and a new enterprise demanded. To subdue the vast and ancient forests and convert them into civilized homes is no light task, and yet it is courageously and fearlessly met. The necessities of life are many and great and pressing. Invention alone — no routine of accustomed toil — can answer the new and growing wants. In the Old World the Puritan had to grapple with pride and luxury and power; in the New with nature. Under circumstances so widely different, how was it possible for his character to remain as it was? In some degree he must adapt himself to his new condition. How well he succeeded in this attempt, the New England character is a happy

and striking illustration. Adaptation has become almost a virtue. In the New World the Puritan had to give over his feuds with the affectations and pride of an old established order, and contend with nature. His complaints against oppression and vicious institutions became useless, without meaning, in his present sphere of life. Other emotions more kind, more in accordance with the good spirit of nature, must take possession of his heart. More or less, the Puritan was bigoted and sectarian, but nature, in her universal love, disallows all narrow and partial sympathies. The change in his character was gradual and slow, but he could not entirely resist the design of Providence, and in the midst of the new and kind influences which were all around him, he grew to be a new and kinder man. He could not go abroad without catching something of the gentle spirit that was breathing upon his soul. His enmities, his prejudices, were at war with nature, but nature was supreme and he was forced to yield. He could not feel at home in the wilds he had sought without the surrender of his old and cherished animosities. This humanizing, expanding process, though not achieved at once, was a sure one, and now we live to witness a still nearer prospect of final and perfect success. The history can be given in a word. The Puritan in the New World stood in the midst of nature and was free. Such influences awoke new and kinder elements within him. They became essential parts of his character.

But other elements than the natural ones became grafted on the Puritan stock. The English were not the only emigrants. Other nations contributed their part to the settlement of America. France, in particular, in point of time and numbers, almost balanced the scale with England. These two leading nations of Europe had never before harmoniously met, nor their characters been permitted to mingle together. Rival and jealous differences had always kept them apart. Now one object was before them, the colonization of a new world. They were brought together. Valuable and noble traits distinguished both, and, united in the same national character, promised almost the perfection of manhood. How entire this union has really become we have no means of knowing, but that the French vivacity and grace have modified the English coldness and gravity,

we cannot doubt, or that American character, through this means, has greatly refined upon the English. That the Puritan would ever have become what he is, or his character have ripened as it now has done, in England and under English influences, we do not believe. The Puritan character was fitted for a new world, and required new elements and a new order of development for its continued growth and perfection. These new elements and this new order is found in the new *natural* and *national* influences by which it became surrounded, and in the midst of which it was destined to act.

What is the result? Has the character of the Puritan yielded to the new influences to which we have referred? Do we witness the effect which we have seen reason to expect? To us the answer is clear. The American character is a new one. We can detect in it great English features. Perhaps these predominate. But the French element is not wholly wanting. Nor has the splendid beauty of our forests and landscapes been lost or insignificant. The Anglo-Saxon stock transplanted to the New World has acquired under the American sky a temperament more finely strung, a delicacy of fibre, a greater susceptibility of the nervous organization, and a deeper feeling of joy or sorrow, which seem peculiarly to fit the American people to excel in what are called the fine or beautiful arts. This opinion is confirmed not only by the causes which we have pointed out as adapted to produce such a character, but also by the rapid growth of these arts in so new a community, by their still more rapid recent progress, by the sudden appearance of genius by which we are so frequently startled, and by the numerous generation of artists of the noblest promise at this moment engaged in the pursuit of excellence.

That we of America are *sensitive* beings, is the judgment of a common observation. This peculiarity of our national character could hardly escape the notice of the most superficial or ignorant. Nor is it all vanity which makes us so tenacious of our good reputation. There is a deep and good meaning in the general remonstrance which is uttered when our American name is assailed. We are glad that it is so — that we are not indifferent to reproach — that we rise up with a common and united feeling to

cast back the word that reflects upon our character. It seems to say that our character is a sacred thing, and therefore to be sacredly guarded — that we *have* a character, and will not suffer detraction — that we have an integrity which we are anxious to maintain — that we cannot bear to hear light words spoken of virtue, though it be our own and therefore humble. The world, we feel, cannot afford to lose anything good, and we are unwilling to sit down in silence under scorn or any unjust reproach. Our sensitiveness may, indeed, sometimes carry us to excess. We may sometimes be open to ridicule. But the error is more a weakness than any lack of virtue. It points back to a distinguishing feature of character, which, in our estimation, is rather an excellence than a defect. That we guard this feeling from all affectation and confine it to virtue, needs to be one of the principal aims of all our discipline and culture. To be sensitive to whatever is ours, irrespectively of character, will result in our degradation. Over this feeling we need to watch with a peculiar delicacy and strictness. Under a true education it promises only good, a refinement of manners, taste and excellence in all that is beautiful and lovely. It contains the noblest promise of a correct appreciation and a rapid growth, among us, of the fine arts.

The spontaneous rise of young men, without the advantages of education or refinement, who have exhibited the finest adaptations to art and have even grown up to no ordinary eminence, is another proof of our position. *Outbursts* of genius in England have been rare, and always the result of long preparation. They are found only in the intervals of ages; and even then are confined to the single department of poetry. In America, considering its youth and means, they are frequent, and their number increases with the years. Here is a point of no common importance in our inquiry. It is the *spontaneous* growth, which most truly indicates the real nature of a nation's character. We do not look amidst the affectations of the city, amidst the conventionalisms of fashionable intercourse, for the true index of any community. In the country, where men are free, where they have no policy and no motive for deceit, where they can live and be themselves, there we detect the true elements and impulses of life. At home, where we unbend and cast off restraint, where none but fa-

miliar eyes are on us, and we have no part to act except that of sincerity and love, there we find what we are in reality. What developes itself thus spontaneously and freely, before the moulding hand of education is put upon it, what thus becomes prominent, is proved to be the leading peculiarity of character. It is that development which exhibits the deepest and truest phase of the individual and social life. It is the index from which we are to judge of the future. Taking this criterion, the promise of American art is by no means small. Nearly all our artists were self-impelled. They have risen with little foreign aid. Their resolves were formed and their consecration to the beautiful determined by a necessity from within themselves, — not by secondary influences, but by religion and love. They have been artists before they knew the meaning of the word. They had the feeling of beauty, and in childhood wrought in rude forms from snow or clay as a part and charm of their earliest sports. Such facts are no insignificant prophecy of future refinement and excellence. Few of our native artists have been destined to the profession. Those whose circumstances have admitted of a liberal education, have generally been enticed into some of the more popular avenues to eminence. Those who have been poor or destitute, have resorted to agriculture or become mechanics. Thus our prominent artists reckon among their number lawyers, machinists, and sign-painters. A few have enjoyed the advantages of our best universities. The majority have been poor and self-taught. All have been without the early culture afforded to the youth of Europe in her numerous schools and galleries. And we cannot account for these frequent evidences of genius, under the unfavorable influences of a new country, furnished with none of the germs of art, and destitute of schools and galleries, without referring back to the essential character of the people. No other cause is sufficient. But we may take even a wider range. A taste for the beautiful is not confined to the professed artists. It is general. Our character does not raise up merely artists, but *lovers* of art. The public feeling, upon the whole, is favorable; we do not mean that it is what it ought to be or may be, but that it is not without happy indications for the future. And success very much depends upon the taste and feeling of the community.

It is necessary to have admirers of art. They are the only Republican patrons. Just as in conversation it is full half of the art to *listen* well.

The history of our artists and the popular feeling on the subject of art confirm the position we have taken. The love of art and the creative power have been spontaneous. They have seemed free outbreaks of native genius — the outworkings of American character. The lives of Allston and Weir and Kellogg among the painters, of Greenough and Clevenger and Powers and Crawford among the sculptors, are striking illustrations. Of our poets Bryant and Longfellow are evidences of the same fact. On the point of *artistic* merit they have few English rivals. Still farther evidences are found in the galleries and institutions for the encouragement of art, which have lately arisen in the principal cities of our country. We do not indeed compare them with similar institutions in Europe. We speak of them simply as indications of American growth — not wonderful in comparison, but certainly wonderful for *us*. Those who speak with incredulity or contempt of the genius of our countrymen in the arts of design, need only a sight of the specimens of painting and sculpture in the Boston Atheneum, and similar rooms in New York and Philadelphia, to do involuntary homage to the skill and power of the artists by whom they were produced.

The views we have taken are further substantiated by the peculiar opportunity presented in our new moral and social position. It is not excellence to imitate. Success in the fine arts depends upon the *creative* faculty. The beautiful is a province of creation. Here in America to repeat the Old World is not desirable; to imitate the follies and sins of European society will be a retrogade movement. To revive the splendid affectations of chivalry is beneath the mission of American freedom. Here let a man live to be himself; let the young man preserve the dew of his youth in the glory of manhood; let him be what nature and all the free and pure influences of God may make him. A new man is unfolding himself here, not merely an old man living in a new world. Elements that have never mingled before are meeting here in a new and more earnest strife. A full grown man of the Old World is here to grapple with life's first necessities, — civilized man with un-

civilized nature. The toil of the past has been more of endurance than achievement. The few who have nobly striven have yielded their birthright or fallen in the contest. The promise of beautiful youth has failed. A New World brings a new opportunity. May the coming strife prove successful!

America, then, is peculiarly fitted for the exercise and development of the creative faculty. It *is* a new world, with new influences and free from old restraints. The temptation to *imitate* is comparatively small. And what the fine arts now demand for a new impulse, what they want in all senses, is not so much galleries and schools, — and these not at all unless they preserve strictly an American character, — not the Cartoons or Elgin marbles, not the grand old pictures even; but a more correct knowledge of what true art really is, — not as Grecian or Italian art, but as a universal and eternal thing,—what are its purposes and objects, and by what means these can be reached. Life in America, we have said, is a new thing, and the artist must be true to the new condition and character. These he must express. By these he must be tried, and not by the masters of the past alone. It is vain to suppose that our social condition, so different from any previous state, will nurture or fashion the arts on any old model. In ourselves we must be our own model. To start in our progress from the old point, that of Grecian or Mediæval art, will be the certain prophecy of failure, for the old sources of inspiration are not about us. Our feelings and sympathies are excited by new influences; they are new themselves. These we must represent, and no others. To these we must be true and loyal. Following any others, we shall be false to ourselves, to our character, and of consequence our toil and love will all be in vain. We must *create*. Imitation will degrade and sink us. Living, as we do, under the influences of a Republican government and the Protestant religion, we must build houses and churches that shall represent these new ideas of national and religious life, — not the palaces of kings, not Catholic cathedrals. We must paint and carve men and women after the likeness of ourselves, not after the forms of Greece or Italy. Our painting and sculpture must represent action as *we* act, and feeling as *we* feel. It will not do to paint

gods or goddesses whom we laugh at, or saints in whom we do not believe, or heroes with whom we have no sympathy. To do anything great we must represent the life that is going on in the New World and in the present, not the life of the Old World and of the past, however ancient or grand or venerable the Old World and the past may seem. We want artists who shall prove themselves as true to the American character as Bryant has proved himself in his poetry, and Webster in his eloquence. If we answer this condition, that is, if we are true to ourselves and if we continue American, we must be a creative people in the Fine Arts as we already are in the Useful. To express faithfully and vigorously the American character and life in the direction of beauty, will produce a new school of art as certainly as our character and life are new and original.

Thus far, we readily admit, that we have *realized* but little. We dwell upon the promise and prophecy, which are by no means insignificant or small. Our success in the arts, as in all things holy and great, will depend upon our fidelity to the influences and condition of the New World. We must maintain and carry out the American character. This is the vital point, and on it we need to fix all our attention. If science and religion flourish, if we keep the national life sound and healthy, then the fine arts will flourish also, and possess a sound and healthy growth. We of America are not Greeks or Italians. Our religion is not theirs, our feelings are widely different, and our civilization has taken a very different character from theirs. Our artists therefore are not to express what *they* believed and felt — that would be imitation. Let them express what *we* believe and feel — this will be creation. For there is not such a spectacle in history as men producing with any power of life what they have not felt, or influencing others by uttering what they have not believed. D. C.

Art. III. — POETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

I. THE FROST.

The frost is out amid our open fields,
And late within the woods I marked his track;
The unwary flower his icy finger feels,
And at its touch the crisped leaf rolls back.
Look, how the maple o'er a sea of green
Waves in the autumnal wind its flag of red!
First struck of all the forest's spreading screen,
Most beauteous too, thou earliest of her dead!
Go on; thy task is kindly meant by Him,
Whose is each flower, and richly covered bough;
And though the leaves hang dead on every limb,
Still will I praise his love; that early now
Has sent before this herald of decay,
To bid me heed the approach of winter's sterner day.

J. V.

II. THE FUNERAL BELL.

I stood amid the bearded corn,
A laborer that summer day;
And heard all songs of nature float
Into the wind — away.

The rain fell fast on distant hills,
And damp and heavy grew the air;
When calmly from the vale below
Stole up a call to prayer —

A funeral toll — distinct and clear,
As ever rang a marriage peal: —
"Pray! pray for one we bury now!
Kneel! kneel! poor mourners, kneel!"

The shadow of the wing of Death
A deeper darkness seemed to lend
Unto the gloom of the flying storm,
Beginning to descend.

Fiercer and fiercer blew the gust,
Tearing the black-piled clouds asunder;
Louder and ever louder rolled
The awful tones of thunder.

Yet soft as chance-notes of a dirge,
Breathed by calm lips, unseen the while;
And low and solemn as they thrill
Some vast cathedral pile;

The music of that passing knell
Kept faltering up and down the lea;
Like bell-notes rung among the Alps,
To bid the tempest flee.

I thought — above the raging storm
The sun shone clear in th' upper sky;
And would again look down on us,
When clouds were driven by.

I thought — above that burial scene,
Where hearts were bowed with weeping griefs,
A spirit, newly winged in heaven,
Hovered, to bring relief.

Soon, fresh and beautiful, the fields
Were spanned with God's benignant smile;
And all within its holy light
Seemed sanctified the while.

The village requiem ceased to throb
Upon the sad, attentive ear:
Oh! may the Father's tenderest smile
Have blest the mourner's tear! R. P. R.

III. A PARABLE.

From the German of Friedrich Rückert.

A PILGRIM led, o'er Syrian sand,
A camel by the halter-band.
The animal, with startled eye,
Grew suddenly so fierce and shy,

And snorted so — for very dread
His leader dropped the rein and fled.
He ran, till, in a sheltered nook
Beside the way, he spied a brook.
Half crazed, he hears the beast behind
Madly snuff up the burning wind.
He crept into the fountain's nook —
Plunged not — but still hung o'er the brook ;
When lo ! a bramble came to view,
That from the fountain's waters grew.
Thereto the man did straightway cling,
Close-crouching, coldly shuddering.
When he looked up, he saw with dread
Peer down that frightful camel's head,
That still more near and frightful grew ; —
And when below he bent his view,
Down in the fountain's depths he saw
A dragon with extended jaw,
That lay there, waiting for his blood,
When he should drop into the flood ; —
For lo ! thus trembling 'twixt the two,
A third wo met the wretch's view.
Where in the cavern's crevice clung
The bush's root, on which he hung,
He saw of mice a busy pair,
One black, one white, close nibbling there.
He saw, the black one and the white
Alternately the root did bite.
They gnawed, they tugged, with snout and foot,
They raked the earth from round the root ;
And as the mould down-rattling fell,
The dragon looked up from the well,
To see how soon the bush would fall
Into the water, load and all.
The man, in terror and despair,
Beset, besieged, beleaguered there,
In vain from this most dread suspense
Sought and besought deliverance.
But as he strains his eager eyes,
Nodding above his head he spies
A twig, with blackberries thick-hung, —
Part of the vine to which he clung.

No more he saw the camel's head,
So hideous — nor the dragon dread —
Nor yet the mice's knavery,
When once the berries met his eye.
The beast o'erhead might snort and blow,
The dragon lurk and gloat below,
And at his side the mice might gnaw, —
The blackberries were all he saw.
They pleased his eyes — he thought them sweet —
Berry on berry did he eat;
So great the pleasure while he ate,
It made him all his fear forget.

Ask'st thou, what foolish man is he,
Forgets such fear so easily?
Know, then, O friend, that man art thou;
For thou shalt hear the moral now.

The dragon down beneath the wave
Is Death's wide-gaping maw — the grave.
The camel, threatening overhead,
Is Life's distress and doubt and dread.
'Twixt Life and Death aye hovering,
Thou dost to Earth's frail thorn-bush cling.
The two that gnaw incessantly
The root that bears the twigs and thee,
To bring thee down to Death's dark might —
The mice's names are — Day and Night.
The black one gnaws, concealed from sight,
From eventide till morning-light:
From morning-light till eventide
The white one gnaws, the root beside.
Yet, in this wild and weary waste,
The berry, Pleasure, tempts thy taste,
Till, — the huge camel, Life's distress,
The dragon, Death, in the abyss,
The busy nibblers, Day and Night,
Forgotten in thy strange delight, —
Of death's dark flood thou dost not think,
But of the berries on its brink. C. T. B.

IV. ALEXANDER'S POWER.

From the Persian: Translated from the German of Rückert.

When Alexander died, he gave command,
They from his coffin should let hang his hand;
That all men who had seen him formerly,
Exulting in the pomp of royalty,
Might now see that with empty hands, alone,
He too the universal road had gone,
And that, of all his treasures, nothing, save
That empty hand, went with him to the grave.

C. T. B.

V. AL-SIRAT.

From the German of Friedrich Rückert.

'Twixt Time and Eternity
Stands the Bridge of Doom;
Filling with fierce radiancy
The dread chasm's gloom.

Know'st thou well, how sharp and fine
That bridge arches there?
Sharp as any sword its line,
Fine as any hair.

Shall the foot of man be set
On a bridge so thin,
Where no room a fly could get
To find footing in?

He that does not firmly dare
Trust himself on this,
Must not hope beyond to share
Eden's dewy bliss.

When the wicked o'er it goes,
Stands the bridge all sparkling;
And his mind bewildered grows,
And his eye swims darkling.

Wakening, giddying, then comes in,
With a deadly fright,
Memory of all his sin,
Rushing on his sight.

Underneath him gapes the chasm; —
Conscience, desperate grown,
Drives him with its maddening spasm
To plunge headlong down.

But when forward steps the just,
He is safe e'en here; —
Round him gathers holy trust,
And repels his fear.

Hope is lifting up his brow,
Love is giving wings;
Faith is smiling, as he now
On so happy springs.

Each good deed is mist, that wide,
Golden borders gets;
And for him the bridge, each side,
Shines with parapets.

Onward still his footsteps fare,
And the bridge is passed,
As 't were built of stones hewn square,
Or of iron cast.

Freimund!* at that pass, thy lays
Thus around thee sweep
Mistful, — that thou may'st not gaze
Down the dizzy deep.

Floating, like the morning wind
O'er the lilies' bed,
Move, — and ever lightly, mind
On the bridge to tread. N. L. F.

* The poetical name which Rückert usually applies to himself.

Art. IV. — SPECULATIVE AND PRACTICAL WISDOM.

The time is one of great speculative activity. For a long period man has been accumulating a vast store of practical experience and of ingenious supposition. He has now compacted from his loose materials the *definite* sciences, and reduced them to a form which will not probably be radically altered by future discoveries; though it is hard to say what new principles of physical science the future may develop. A disposition is apparent in the public mind to reduce the less accurate sciences to some tolerable degree of precision. From the golden dreams of Plato down to Kant and Cousin and Fichte, all systems are ransacked, criticised and compared; that modern eclecticism may discover, or daring speculation make a road, by which our intellect may escape from wrangling and incertitude, to some simple, self-approving, daylight truth. Worn out with endless jars and disgusted by continual failure, sober common sense longs for a relief from speculation. The eagerness of the search after the means of its attainment is leading everywhere to intense thought, and in not a few cases, to great extravagance. The result as yet is but little more than giving a new shape to confusion, and multiplying unsettled questions. There are few points of agreement between the various theories, except in the great leading principles, the inheritance as it were of humanity, — principles so based upon the clearest perceptions, or so plainly deducible from argument, as to claim universal faith. But beyond these great axioms all is, and ever has been, confusion and disagreement; characterized chiefly, either by a blind faith in partial systems, or a restless skepticism as to all systems. It is evident that the human mind asks earnestly for answers to questions forced upon it by its temporal wants and its spiritual yearnings; and that it has not yet found these answers in the schemes of theorists, however satisfactory those schemes may be to their originators. Perhaps no unequivocal reply ever will be obtained. But the queries will forever be put, and never cease to be the great subjects of human inquiry.

The two extremes of ethical science are now represented by materialism, naturalism, or utilitarianism on one hand, and transcendentalism, spiritualism, or mysticism on the

other. So great and so subtle are the distinctions and disagreements, even among the advocates of the same theory, that it is impossible to present, even in the form of general principles, the characteristics of each, with any tolerable succinctness. The best that can be done, in a brief sketch for the purposes of collation and inquiry, is to note tendencies and actual results.

The first set of systems rejects the abstract and expends its energies entirely upon the concrete. Disregarding all mere speculations, it seeks to connect principles at once with practice, and proves their truth or falsity, and fixes their extent and value, not by abstract reasonings, but by experimental utility. It is solely in their applicability to our purposes, that it recognizes their existence or their merit, paying little or no regard to abstractions. That is and is right, which is operating and operating to the benefit of man; that is and is wrong, which is found operating to his injury.

It is objected to these systems, that they compress the sphere of thought to the comparatively narrow limits of the actual; thereby degrading reason, and in some measure practically denying the existence, or at any rate, the use of some of the purer and nobler affections and faculties: secondly, that they tend to debase the spiritual nature by a constant reference to expediency; taking away the moral standard and elevated feeling of abstract right — of virtue to be followed and loved for its own sake and because it is acceptable to God.

Now upon these censures, candor may offer two suggestions at least. First, if these systems are of a practical character, savoring more of the sordidness of interest than of the loftiness of noble purposes, the blame should fall partly upon circumstances. They are the necessary reaction induced by the futile speculations and scholastic nonentities of previous theories. They are the evident and plausible attempt of the mind to escape from a maze of discussions without end, both as to their prolixity and their results, which had induced the conviction that it was hopeless to look for any useful or agreeable issues from them. Wearied of idle abstractions, philosophy sought refuge and endeavored to find a renewal of hope in a thoroughly experimental method. Secondly, it may be questioned

whether there is, after all, any error in the identification of the right and the expedient, of utility and virtue. If Providence and nature are terms for the will of the Deity unfolded and exerted in creation, and if the Deity acts therein in conformity with his accorded attributes of beneficence, omniscience and omnipotence, then it would seem to follow strictly, that the true, the right, and the expedient must be one and the same. The wisdom of God must be truth, his purpose must be right, and his motive the ultimate good of all creation. Now these propositions appear to embrace no fallacy: and if not, then real and ultimate expediency must be right. Virtue must be, of its own nature, happiness; and vice, of necessary consequence, misery. These points being conceded, the only remaining questions would be two; —whether an experimental and actual expediency, or a theoretic and speculative dogma, be the safer guide to the truth; and whether the prospect of happiness be the proper, or best inducement to hold out for the practice of virtue.

We think that the difficulties raised exist rather in the deficient carrying out and partial development of the system, than in a radical error; and that a philosophical and expanded doctrine of utility might perhaps be led up to results as perfect and motives as pure as those of any other system. Let us state a proposition in two ways. The spiritualist says; —

Virtue is obedience to the will of God, and therefore a duty. It is consonant with and necessary to the dignity of man, and therefore should be practised by him.

The naturalist says; —

Facts prove that virtue is conducive to the real happiness and best interests of man; therefore, if he is wise, he will practise it.

The first statement assumes a principle not so easily deducible by the generality of minds, nor so easily proved, as the material facts assumed in the second. Herein it may be less likely to prove an effectual incentive to the practice of virtue. The leading proposition in the first must be derived from pure reason, while in the second it is drawn from observation. In many instances, though perhaps not so much in this particular one, it is to be apprehended that there would be less certainty and obviousness, to most

minds, in the first process than in the second. But the grand objection to the second is the vulgarity and selfish narrowness of the motive implied and appealed to in the reasoning. But, if we follow it out to its necessary deductions, is not this objection removed? For instance, the naturalist may proceed as follows; — the reason why virtue is expedient is, that the beneficent wisdom of God has so constituted all things, that right action shall constantly be productive of good, and wrong action of evil, more or less distinctly to the agent as well as to the object. This is the immutable, wise and kind law of Supreme Intelligence and Love. By obeying this law, you are in harmony with God and his purposes: by infringing it, you are at issue with them. Does not the complete statement of the *whole* truth introduce every higher motive, and do away the difficulty? Love to God and expanded affection to man, faith in the truth and hope in the right, are as readily and as necessarily deduced from this formula, as from the spiritual one; while its strong appeal to human nature, as we find it, remains unimpaired. In the first case, the reasoning stands thus: —

Virtue is the will of God, and moral right. These it is our duty to observe. Therefore we should practise virtue.

In the second case the reasoning is: —

Virtue and happiness have been made inseparable by God. Happiness is desirable. Therefore we should practise virtue.

There is a deficiency in both. The first neglects the natural truths, which are perhaps the most powerful proofs and strongest inducements to belief and consequent practice. This deficiency some minds might not readily supply; and the axiom loses at least a portion of its interest for, and hold upon humanity. The second passes over the moral duties of feeling and practice, which grow out of the relations it asserts: but few minds probably would fail to feel them, after distinct comprehension of the premises from which they result. Moreover, there is nothing in the practical creed of the naturalist to prevent his proceeding to the fullest development and enforcement of the resulting moral obligation; though it must be confessed that it has not been done to so great an extent as would be desirable. But in spiritualism there is often an unwise and supercilious

scorn of all secondary motives, that tends greatly to keep out of sight many highly important relations of our being, and to conceal the beautiful consistency and perfect uniformity, in essence and operation, of universal truth.

Let us take another example. "Thou shalt not steal." What can the spiritualist add, upon his scheme, to the simple command? If a reason be asked, he must reply — Thou shalt not do it, because it is forbidden, and because it is, in itself, an act wicked, vile and degrading. This is all well. The materialist would add the cogent reasonings to be drawn from the wants of society, and enforce them by the selfish but pertinent motive, that being contrary to the welfare of the whole, it is so to the welfare of each, the wrong-doer as well as others. And here again the argument, though not directly specifying, necessarily infers from the acknowledged authorship of our condition here, the additional motive drawn from the will of God and regard to moral duty.

But spiritualism refuses the aid of such extraneous and subordinate motive, and relies solely upon pure moral obligation. It dwells in the abstract and scorns the concrete. It attempts to develop to the uttermost human capacity, while it studiously strips reason of the incalculable aid it may find in the proper direction of the passions and affections, and the thorough knowledge of utilitarian considerations. Transcendentalism, while it inculcates the most lofty faith in human capacity, seems to reject faith in everything else. It assumes that pure reason is all-sufficient for us, and that to derive a conviction or draw a motive from any other source, is to derogate from our moral dignity and to drink from a polluted spring.

Now it seems to us that the divinely inspired philosophy of our Saviour proceeds upon different ground. He seldom appeals to any but the purest motives, for his object was to reveal, not to reason out the truth. His was the part of the prophet as well as of the instructer. But even he gave as the golden rule of life — "Do unto others, as ye would they should do unto you." Here he indisputably appeals directly to our self-love, and even makes the cravings of individual interest the standard of right. And can it be said, that in this much admired precept there is any lack of elevation and purity? Yet it speaks not to the

moral sense abstracted from everything but pure principle, but to the concrete notjons that constitute our most tangible and vivid conceptions of right and wrong.

Indeed, unless the spiritualist assume all reason and all moral sense to be pure inspiration, we do not see the validity of the objection to the consideration of any and every inducement and argument that in anywise bears upon a point of ethics. If we are to reason out our duty at all, why not reason upon practical as well as abstract truths? The effect carries with it as much argument as the cause; the consequences are often more plain and convincing than the principle from which they result. And if our convictions of right are to assume the form of a holy faith, rather than acquiescence in proof, shall we not have faith in nature as well as in revelation or inspiration? He who reveals the precept or inspires the aspiration, has also created a universe according to the exercise of the same will and upon the principles of the same love, wisdom and power. We cannot suppose that he is inconsistent with himself; that he promulgates to the spirit of man one law and stamps upon the creation, of which that same spirit is a coerced and connected portion, another and a contradictory law. Why not then see with the eye of faith the purposes of the Deity in his material works, as well as in his Word or his supposed inspiration through the mind or heart?

But if it were inevitable, that arguments drawn from and ending in palpable consequences, or in mere selfish individuality, must drown or materially impair the nobler powers and blunt the finer aspirations of man, then we should deprecate the consequences not less than the most enthusiastic transcendentalist; and it might perhaps be a sufficient reason for foregoing all the advantages of these influences. But there is no apparent necessity for such a result: although it must be admitted that, from the natural extravagance of a mental reaction, the secondary arguments have been allowed to supersede, with some writers, the primary principles. This should not be, and need not be.

The grand objection to the mystic or spiritual theories is, that as they set up their own oracle, admitting no control from authority and no explanation from the external world, others may look upon its decisions as taking a coloring as much from prejudice or personal qualities as either from

reason or a divine inspiration. It was said that augur could not look in the face of augur without laughing; but here the laugh will be likely to be on the side of the people even as against the *pontifex maximus* himself. He who assumes the existence within him of a reason, either natural or supernatural, competent to decide all points without aid or comparison, may perfectly satisfy his own judgment, but will not probably command the assent of others; nor be very likely to attain to so much abstract truth as others, who invoke aid from the wide circle of human experience and defer somewhat to apparent authority, human and Divine.

The transcendentalist, indeed, attaches little importance to any uniformity and consentaneousness of conviction, but allows every man, like the Bunker's hill patriot, to fight out the battle of life, "on his own hook." There are most manifest difficulties in this arrangement. Except we presuppose infallibility all round, it would necessarily involve society in confusion and derangement. There are very many points which must not be lightly disputed; and which, if not unquestionable, must command peaceable acquiescence, or all social harmony and government are at an end at once. We shall have occasion to recur to this topic.

Common sense will for the most part reject the practical absurdities to which these abstractions lead, and even many who conscientiously advocate them will instinctively eschew their legitimate conclusions. Still there will be a palpable deficiency in all these systems, inasmuch as they fail fully to satisfy the wants of man. While the physical, intellectual and ethical sciences were in their infancy, it was both useful and necessary that their different branches should receive a distinct and separate scrutiny, in order to establish the facts and fix the principles which lie at their foundations. But it seems to us that the time is now come for a new process, which shall combine all these, and apply them in a compacted and coherent form to our nature and our purposes. These *disjecta membra* have done for us all the service of which they are capable, and we now wish to see them assume the real semblance of human life. We have pulled out one by one and measured and ticketed each stone and beam of the structure, and it now remains to restore all to their appropriate places and uses, and by reconstruction to gain a complete idea of the whole edifice. But

while the stones of the foundation lie on one side, and those of the walls on another, the beams in this spot, the columns and their capitals in that, although a skilful architect may possibly in imagination picture to himself its full proportions, it is to the common eye but an unsightly chaos.

We believe that this process must soon be resorted to. The world is weary of quiddities and entities, of old ideas with new names, and new extravagances with profound German nomenclatures. All these things for the most part result in next to nothing, and the interest which they excite in the every-day world is of corresponding insignificance. The general mind asks for a philosophy that will develop and explain our whole being — as it is — a complex thing, not resolvable, in the present state of matters, into its constituent elements, but constantly acting from the joint efficacy of manifold impulses.

Why should we speculatively separate the theories of our bodies, our intellect, and our soul, when experience admonishes us with every breath we draw, that they have not and cannot have any separate existence or separate manifestation in this life? We are endeavoring to put asunder what God has joined. Scarcely an act of any human being can be instanced or supposed, in which matter and mind, or soul, act purely and independently of their relations to each other. The hot and fierce passions and the subtile affections incessantly influence the lordly intellect, and in many cases rob it of its supremacy. The strength or weakness of the body, and the sensuous faculties, continually modify the intensity and operations of their cognate allies. Any attempt to analyse either alone, and without reference to these intimate and active relations, is almost an idle folly. It seems to us, that it is the disregard of them that has rendered ethical and metaphysical conclusions so vague and unsatisfactory. It is impossible fully to comprehend the phenomena, the necessities and capacities of either portion of our nature, without taking into view their mutual connexion and constant reaction upon each other. If it were desired to describe some complicated machine — for instance, a steam-engine — in such a manner as to impart a full idea of it and the power of working it to advantage, it would not be done by a disconnected sketch of its distinct portions only; but by a complete description of the whole

taken together, as well as of its several minute contrivances. An ingenious and accomplished engineer, indeed, by careful consideration of drawings of its levers, cylinders, boilers and pistons, might succeed, after thorough and laborious investigation, in reconstructing its parts and giving a shrewd guess at its motive-power and its purposes. But to most minds this would be a task of difficulty and doubt; and to many, a sheer impossibility. A Cuvier may arrange the skeleton of an antediluvian monster from a heap of mouldering and disjointed bones; but to a less experienced and skilful eye, it would be a hopeless task. What those scattered relics are to the animal in its active existence and perfect shape, *that* are the unconnected and undigested speculations on mind, matter and spirit to a coherent, systematic view, such as we would propose. If the engineer should sit down and compute the powers of his engine from the mathematical forces represented by its wheels, its levers and its original impulsion, without regard to its combinations and its elements of friction, his results would be far from the results of actual experience. Though they might be abstractly true, they would be practically false, and would furnish no very safe guide for action. And just so, speculations based solely upon any one province of our compound being, and regardless of the countless affinities and controlling sympathies, often silent and secret, but constant and irresistible, must be still more grossly deficient. They may answer certain purposes in extracting the elements of science, and laying foundations upon which more sufficient and complete deductions may be reared; but they cannot furnish in themselves a perfect guide, either for thought or practice. It is true, that in the application due allowances may be made and the results rectified; but the process is a circuitous and confused one, involving great additional trouble, if not in many instances eventual failure. We do not believe that it can ever be sound policy to disguise the simple truth. No sublimity of mode or elevation of purpose can suffice to render error preferable.

Therefore a system of philosophy which shall fully recognize and proceed upon this immutable and intimate connexion and coëxistence of the various elements of our being, will have a vast superiority over all previous systems. It will furnish to the speculative mind the exact and complete

truth, and to the humbler inquirer the faithful, efficient and safe rule of practice. Its principles will not be found to be either partially or wholly irreconcilable with the actual processes of life, or incomprehensible by the common sense of the mass of mankind. It will no longer be a portrait, of considerable resemblance perhaps, but filled up and colored according to the painter's fancy or the painter's interest; but a daguerrotyped fac-simile of humanity, drawn with a pencil of light and warm with the direct radiance of the great Life-giver.

If such a system could be faithfully and truly elaborated, each phase of character would find in it the sympathies it would seek and the instruction it would require. Its universality of scope would embrace all peculiarities, and its truth reconcile them all, and reduce the discordant plans and views of sectarian zeal, if not to agreement, at least to harmony. The embodiment of human nature, it would gather everything human to itself, and have a voice of sympathy and instruction for all.

Speculation and theory too would become more impartial and enlightened. Each department being fairly represented and taken into account, partiality would be, comparatively at least, without excuse and without motive.

The real or supposed inconsistencies, and even contradictions, between speculative and practical wisdom are matter of constant comment in every-day life. The sagacious man of the world shrinks with instinctive caution from the theorist. He will base his operations solely upon experience, and commit their execution to those only whom experience has instructed and success has proved. To be termed a philosopher or a scholar, would be a more than doubtful recommendation in the busy world. The assertion that a man's studies and meditations have been such as to teach him the best possible way of doing a thing, is almost universally taken as proof indisputable of his utter incapacity to do it. Now it is not so with the other sciences. Study and profound mathematical and physical knowledge are far from being disqualifications to the engineer. He applies readily and felicitously his abstract information, and builds upon it his best hopes of success. Why then should the metaphysician be *ex officio* a child in the management of the very propensities and capacities

of humanity which have been the study of his life; or the poet or classical scholar be unequal to the common demands of the existence whose elements are his meditation and his theme? We admit that there is a native and inherent dissimilarity between those minds that are most strongly bent upon abstractions, and those which willingly expend their energies upon the actual and executive functions of society. But the broad distinction between the *rationale* and the practice could not be so glaring or so ridiculous as it has sometimes been, if there were not a gross deficiency in the mental culture and a lamentable short-coming in results.

This consequence is effected in a two-fold way. First, by the partial, onesided and unhealthy development of the intellect, which leaves the whole man, however exalted and finished in some particulars, weak and inefficient in others: secondly, by the equally partial, onesided, and, of course, in a degree false character of the speculative deductions themselves. In very many cases these latter are only true, or at any rate accurate, upon peculiar hypotheses and under special circumstances, which frequently exist chiefly in the idiosyncracy of the authors; who, in fine, make a world for themselves, partly of fact and partly of fancy, instead of thoroughly analysing and fairly comprehending the real operations of Divine wisdom and the actual sphere of human action. Their mental operations are erroneous, both from education and habit. The most prominent causes of error are an ill-balanced and unfinished character, and the want of a full comprehensive philosophy which should present man and his works, his duties, rights and capacities, in their true form and relative connexion.

The changes that have been wrought in the character of many classes of literary men, by the rapid advance and wide extension of general knowledge and the concentration of general principles during the past century, furnish strong confirmation of this position. Some of the bright ornaments of New England are living proofs that the golden-sanded streams of Pactolus may roll in the same channel with the waters of Helicon, and we hope and believe the time may come when Castalian dews may help to ripen more substantial fruits than poetic visions.

It is dissatisfaction with the defective results which we

have noticed, that leads active minds to extravagances. Transcendentalism appears to have enshrined itself with some few of the proudest intellects and loftiest spirits of the time. Those who can appreciate and sympathize with them, will find something to admire, as well as much to pity and blame. The source and spring of their error seems to us obvious. It is one of those cases where purity of spirit and energy of intellect are made to give additional perversity and cause more fatal aberration. It is a fanaticism, the qualified truth and purposed loftiness of whose principles does something to disarm censure, and much to blind its advocates to their incoherencies. But the admiration which elevation and disinterestedness would claim, is lost from inconsequence and temerity. Wearied and indignant, the transcendentalist would turn his eyes entirely from earth and its grovelling aims and petty contrivings, and fasten his kindling eye upon the starry heavens, where reign uninterrupted, sublime and alone, that purity which he loves and that mighty wisdom with which his own bold intellect claims kindred. But while his spirit soars, his feet must still rest upon the earth; and the intellect which can pass the wanderings of the stars and spurn the limits of space, is bound up in a frame which must obey the most rigid laws of matter and be cramped within the limits of a mortal individuality. The mystic seems also to forget that the sublime and all-expansive reason, upon which alone he would rely, and for and through which alone he would live, derives much of its power and almost all its motive, in its present condition, from its allied passions and sympathies. It is indeed reason that ennobles the man, but it is the man and his hopes and fears, his plans and purposes, and even his follies, that lend energy and power to reason itself. The mythology of Greece, all paganism and poetry though it be, will sometimes furnish a lesson to the most confident reasoners, for it sprang from the deep bosom of humanity and grew out of its instincts, its wants and hopes. In intellectual Athens, Venus and Apollo, Mars and Mercury shared with Minerva the worship of her tutelar votaries, and the broad ægis and the Medusan spell of its gorgon visage were necessary to complete the idea of intellectual power, even to the spiritual Greek. Whatever we may desire, we cannot altogether divorce matter and mind.

If reason have in its *essence* no limits and no imperfection, it is certainly circumscribed and modified in its operations by practical limits, which it is the extreme of rashness to overlook. However pure and perfect this nobler portion of our nature may be supposed to be in itself, it is inseparably united in this world to elements obviously imperfect and fallible. It can operate only through physical means, partial and uncertain; and it will not operate at all, except at the instigation of affections and passions notoriously capricious and delusive. It is highly erroneous therefore, to assume the right and duty of perfectly independent thought and action, in virtue of which some ardent reformers would deny the obligations of society and the control of all authority extraneous to their own internal conviction. Such a prerogative can justly appertain only to infallibility; and human nature has not the right, nor, in effect, the power to exercise it. Whatever the deductions of reason might be, the deductions of the human mind, as it is constituted and as it must operate, are liable to great and constant error. With the purest purpose and the highest care, obliquity and perversity will mingle with our most elaborate conclusions. Therefore we cannot safely reject authority. It is only by comparison of opinions correcting each other, by collation of views formed under countervailing influences, that abstract truth can in anywise be hoped for.

The position, that each man should act entirely and solely upon his own independent conviction, is no less false. If there were only in question his own private interests and action in no wise affecting others, he might be justifiable, perhaps commendable, in following to the utmost his honest conviction. Yet even here, there might arise much doubt as to the prudence with which a conclusion widely differing from that of almost all beside himself could be implicitly received and unhesitatingly acted upon. But where the constituted order and accepted law of society must be infringed, since he is himself fallible, subject to delusions and caprices and errors from a thousand sources, he is bound, on all philosophical principles, strongly to question the accuracy of his deduction, however plain and imperative it may appear. He must not assume the impossibility of his

own error, in the same breath with which he imputes error to thousands as pure and as intelligent as himself. Opposition to law and order and prescriptive right is of the nature of treason, and carries with it a fearful responsibility. Its correctness should therefore be placed beyond a reasonable doubt, before it be considered a proper ground of action. In many a case the modesty of true philosophy and Christian humility might with much advantage have prevented the miseries, as well as have surpassed the moral desert of the martyr's crown.

There must be, it is true, a limit to this doctrine. Conscience has her sphere and her duty, and wrong must be combated manfully, and sometimes at every hazard. It is a bold position that logic is competent to decide all questions, or even of the highest authority in all. There are things we feel, but can hardly prove. These things too are, from their nature, the highest and holiest facts of all. Though not compressible within a syllogism, they have in the convictions of most men a hold that argument can scarcely strengthen, and which no argument can destroy. To treat these universal convictions as idle fictions or foolish prejudices, is unphilosophical and wicked. Indeed, we feel some doubt whether they really conflict at all with the empire of reason, and whether such matters of belief as the existence of the Deity, the immortality of the soul, the abstract feeling of right and wrong, may not be in truth the highest manifestations of reason and the strongest proof of its divine nature. For why may we not consider them, not as innate ideas, or inspirations, but simple processes of reason, which do not appear to be such solely because our nature in its present state has not language to express, nor energies fully to comprehend, the full and logical statement of the truth. We may imagine reason walking here below with her material and grosser sisterhood. From time to time she catches a glimpse of the far-off heaven, as the mists part for an instant that curtain in the earth. Glowing with conceptions of glorious truth, she turns to her companions and would fain impart to them the sublime information. But the tongue has not power to repeat, nor even can the flagging imagination rise to the level of the conception. The more heavily moulded sisters can but catch, from the fire that flashes in the eye and the eloquent lineaments of the breathing fea-

tures, a subdued, vague and passive conviction, the impression of which endures, nevertheless, undoubted and implicitly believed forever.

It is at any rate unwise, if nothing worse, to reject whatever mocks the power of our logic. We must take something upon trust, and credulity is far preferable in such matters to a cold and heartless skepticism. But we cannot pretend either to analyze existing systems or to develop all the materials for new ones, and we return for a moment to the original consideration we have suggested.

Once more then, the errors and extravagances, the over-fond theories and the over-scrupulous negations, that deform philosophy and perplex and disgust the inquirer, seem to us to arise from inadequate and partial views. There is but one way of arriving at sound and accurate conclusions; and that is, by faithful investigation and analysis of all the facts that belong to human nature, whether of body or of mind, of heart or soul. We want a faithful picture of man, in his complex being and his manifold relations. We want an analysis of each part and a re-construction of the whole in its natural connexion, that will enable us to discern the secrets and fathom the capacities of our being, to know its weaknesses and its strength, its purposes and its means of accomplishment, its separate faculties and their combinations. Then we shall be able to judge correctly and to plan wisely, to comprehend results and prepare ourselves to control them. And we believe that a system of this sort, ably and honestly digested, would throw a flood of light upon the dark places. It would clear up mysteries that now throw gloom and sadness over many a heart. It would check fanaticism, and refute bigotry. It would be fatal to error and presumption, and secure the triumph of correct and genial principles. It is a mighty task, but it will be done. Some Newton of metaphysics will find and follow out the clue, and read in the rapture of successful labor a greater harmony than that of the spheres, the harmony of reason, sympathising with, if not thoroughly comprehending the eternally true and holy.

The Heathen, in despair, threw an impenetrable stole over the features of the marble in which he imaged the spirit of the universe, and wrote upon the base of the statue of the mighty Mother the reluctant admission — "No man

hath lifted the veil that covers me." But we dare to hope that Christian faith and advancing knowledge may yet master, to a great extent, the solemn secret, and one day sound to the expectant ear of our race that key-note of creation, which shall at last compose all seeming discords and reduce to harmony the jarring and uneasy elements of mortal life.

G. H. D.

Art V.—LIFE OF BLANCO WHITE.*

At the close of the article on Blanco White in the last number of the Examiner, the writer intimates that another view of his autobiography might be presented, which the peculiar object of his article did not comprehend. The aim of that paper was to review in part the *opinions* of Blanco White, the aim of the present is to furnish a sketch of his life with some notices of his character. We derive all our knowledge of Blanco White from the work before us, and surely no man ever furnished the world with more complete materials for fully understanding either his opinions, his conduct, or his character. The "Confessions" of Rousseau are not more remarkable for their candor and minuteness of details, than this autobiography. It would seem as if nothing but a regular education at the confessional, first as penitent and then as priest, could enable any man to turn himself so wholly inside out. As a curiosity in psychological literature, the work would deserve the utmost attention, were its subject less interesting than he is. But in our judgment it would be difficult to find a man, the workings of whose mind and heart it were better worth while to observe.

Joseph Blanco White was born at Seville, Spain, July 11, 1775. His ancestors were Irish on the father's side, his grandfather having emigrated from Waterford in Ireland to Spain, just before his father's birth. They were Catholic. His mother, a woman of fine intellect, was

---

* *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, written by Himself, with portions of his Correspondence.* Edited by John Hamilton Thom. 3 vols. London. 1845.

connected with the old Andalusian "noblesse." His father was engaged in commercial pursuits, and although not rich, was able to maintain his family in the highest respectability. Joseph was brought up "with deeply inculcated habits of gentility." His mother despised trade as in itself demeaning, and did all she could to frustrate the father's intentions of educating her son to his own business. She had him instructed in Latin and in music by the time he was eight years old, and so encouraged his natural taste for knowledge, that his mercantile training became disgusting to him, as contrasted with his other pursuits. He declared his intention to become a priest, and his father and mother were both too deeply religious and too much under the influence of Catholic superstition, to oppose so holy a purpose, even had their judgment disapproved it. But it was in the highest degree gratifying to his mother.

The truly religious character of his parents and their complete devotion to the Romish Church is one of the most interesting views opened in the work. They were persons of intelligence, of taste, of lofty virtue, of scrupulous conscience, and at the same time enthusiastic devotees to Catholicism. Blanco White represents their implicit obedience to their own views of religion as their greatest misfortune, and his own. But it is beautiful to see such fidelity to duty, and such practical benevolence, existing in the shadow of such dreadful superstition. The father spent a large part of every Sabbath in visiting the hospitals, exposing himself fearlessly to the most infectious disorders when raging with their most alarming fury. It would not have been strange if their son, with such evidences of real piety in his home, had grown up with an unquestioning confidence in the religion of his parents.

Joseph was brought up entirely without companions of his own age. He had no brother, and his sisters were both sent to convents for their education. This made him solitary during his childhood. His early education was confined to the catechism and the jargon of School divinity. At twelve he had read no book, but "the Lives of the Saints," — except Don Quixote, by stealth, and Telemachus, a book which excited his earliest doubts; which he confesses to the priest, who smiles at the innocent skepticism of the child. He complains of the laborious observ-

ance of the Sabbath, which made him dread its return. At fourteen, an unquenchable thirst for knowledge takes possession of him. He read at this period a work of Feyjoo, a secret skeptic, in ten or twelve quartos, and imbibed from it the rudiments of the Baconian philosophy, which was in direct opposition to the whole spirit of his faith and education. He refers back to the opinions and feelings which reigned in his mind at this age, as being identical with those which governed him through subsequent life. He rejoices at sixty in his identity with the boy at fifteen. "A great love of knowledge and a hatred of established errors" took possession of him at that early age.

He had been placed at fourteen at a College of Dominicans in Seville, but remains there only a short time and is removed to the University. Here he falls in with a tutor, Arjona, who is struck with his talents and takes him, with two others, under his special charge. This instructer, a priest, possesses extraordinary abilities and great worth, but "has that in his mind which could not fail to place him in a state of jarring dissonance with the religion of Spain." At this time, however, he is sincerely devoted to the Catholic religion. He initiates his pupil into French and Italian literature, and conducts with great success his Latin, rhetorical and oratorical studies, while he encourages his clerical tastes and purposes. We will add in passing, as an illustration of the tendencies of the Catholic system upon the best minds, that this Arjona, a priest and a scholar, becomes in the end a complete skeptic and a dissolute character.

Joseph has, in accordance with the custom, chosen a confessor upon entering the University, at the church of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. He was guided in his choice by the splendor of the service at this particular chapel, by his love of music, which was carried to consummate perfection here, and by his inherited admiration of the Jesuits, who directed this church. He represents this St. Philip Neri, "as the spiritual opera-house of Seville," and being accomplished in music, he was accustomed, as a volunteer in the orchestra upon high festivals, to play from morning till sunset, "till his fingers were ready to bleed;" an illustration of the enthusiasm of his temperament.

He complains of the extreme drudgery of his religious duties, during the whole period of his youth, when he fully believed in their efficacy and sanctity; of the weariness of waiting on his knees for his turn to confess; or of looking on while the priest went through "mass;" and of the long and unmeaning sermons to which he was compelled to listen. From fourteen to twenty-seven, the age at which for a time he became an unbeliever, he never, except under serious illness, omitted reading in an audible voice the whole service for the day out of the Breviary, which at the most rapid rate took an hour and a quarter. Nor was this the most burdensome task imposed upon him. He describes an exercise called "Oracion Mental," which was prescribed by his confessor, as still more annoying. It consisted in an hour equally divided between reading unmeaning books of devotion, and meditating upon the knees in perfect silence on what had been read. Although wholly incapable of fixing his attention, his sense of duty compelled him, watch in hand, to go through with this useless drudgery for many years.

"It is indeed," he exclaims, "a matter of surprise to me at this moment, how I could, for so long a period, submit to such a series of fatiguing practices, and yet find time and strength for my mental studies. To feel indignant at this distance of time may be absurd; but it is with difficulty I can check myself, when I remember what I have suffered in the name of religion." —Vol. i. p. 29.

The ardent imagination, with the decided love of every enjoyment, which characterised White, made him twice during his preparation for orders desire to quit the clerical profession, but domestic influence overruled his wishes. In speaking of the conflict between his love of freedom and his professional bondage and dependence upon the direction of his confessor, there occur these valuable observations upon the tendency of Confession.

"In a country where every person's conscience is in the keeping of another, in an interminable succession of moral trusts, the individual conscience cannot be under the steady discipline of self-governing principle: all that is practised is *obedience* to the opinions of others; and even that obedience is inseparably connected with the idea of a dispensing power. If you can obtain an opinion favorable to your wishes, the responsibility

falls on the adviser, and you may enjoy yourself with safety. The adviser on the other hand, having no consciousness of the action, has no sense of remorse, and thus the whole morality of the country, except in very peculiar cases, wants the steady ground of individual responsibility." — Vol. i. p. 33.

We may add while on the subject of confession another extract.

"I will not stop to urge the grounds of a conviction, on which I have enlarged elsewhere — that auricular confession is one of the most mischievous practices of the Romanist Church. To those who are not totally ignorant of the philosophy of morals, it must be clear that such minute attention to individual faults — not to trace them to their source in the heart, but in order to ascertain whether they are *venial* or *mortal* sins according to the judgment of another man — must, in an infinite number of cases, check the development of conscience, and may totally destroy it in many. As far as my experience extends, the evils of auricular confession increase in proportion to the sincerity with which it is practised. * * * Many, indeed, were the evils of which my subsequent period of disbelief in Christianity (a disbelief full of spite for the evils inflicted upon me in its name) was the occasion; yet I firmly believe that but for the buffetings of that perilous storm, scarcely a remnant of the quick moral perception which God had naturally given to my mind would have escaped destruction by the emaciating poison of confession. I judge from the certain knowledge of the secret conduct of many members of the clergy, who were deemed patterns of devotion. Like those wretched slaves, I should have been permanently the worse for the custom of sinning and washing away the sin by confession. Free, however, from that debasing practice, my conscience assumed the rule, and, independently of hopes and fears, it clearly blamed what was clearly wrong, and, as it were, learnt to act by virtue of its natural supremacy." — Vol. i. pp. 43, 44.

We know no writer who has better explained and illustrated the connexion between animal spirits and religious enthusiasm than the author of this work, and whoever would see the machinery by which in the Catholic Church the imagination is rendered master of the reason, and the bodily passions are made to do the work of the moral affections, should read his account of the "Spiritual Exercises" under the direction of Father Vega, contained between the thirty-fifth and fiftieth pages of the first volume.

Blanco White's natural disgust for the "cloying and

mawkish devotion" in which he was compelled to participate made him very anxious to abandon his profession. His father would have supported him even at the last moment in this resolution, but his mother's tears so wrought upon his tender heart, that he had not strength to disappoint her fondest hope, and at the age of twenty-one he allowed himself to be admitted to sub-deacon's orders.

There follow in the narrative some very interesting, but painful statements of the author upon the celibacy of the clergy, in which he declares unchastity to be the very general result. His opportunities as a confessor of knowing the condition of females in the nunneries, reveal a shocking state of impurity among that incarcerated race of vestals.

He now passes four years in College as a Fellow, preparatory to taking priest's orders. It was not a season of improvement or of happiness. As the time approached, a sincere and determined effort to resume the retired life of his early youth, and obtain the peace of mind which had left him, returned. He had, he says, "an awful sense of the dignity of the priestly office and trembled at the idea of profaning it." With these feelings he entered the priesthood.

It is impossible to recount even the principal events which now succeeded in his life. His ambition was aroused, and he made many and great efforts to distinguish himself. In public competitions for honors and places he was crowned with success, and there opened before him a professional career of honor and influence, bounded only by his ambition. But this career was quickly obstructed by his unconquerable skepticism. He gives the following account of his change of opinions.

"The history of my change from a sincere belief of the Roman Catholic Creed to a total disbelief of Christianity, has been faithfully recorded in my works on Romanism. * * * My rejection of Christianity was the necessary result of a free examination of that spurious, but admirably contrived form in which I had received it. I did not deny Christianity in order to live without a moral law. My change was not the effect of vicious inclinations, or immoral practices. My conduct was perfectly correct, when in spite of the most earnest efforts to resist conviction, I found conviction irresistible. In rejecting Christianity as an imposture I was certainly wrong, but I cannot discover how it could be possible in *my circumstances* to have

separated pure Christianity from the mass of error and deceit which concealed it from my eyes." — Vol. i. pp. 108, 9.

"Who could have thought," he adds, "that in these circumstances, and just at the period when I was most seriously and conscientiously employed in the duties of my profession, a moral and intellectual storm would fall upon me, which would at once sweep away all the religious impressions so industriously and so long inculcated on my mind; which was to make the prospect of honors and emoluments in the Church odious to me, and a residence in my native country perfectly intolerable? Yet so it was, in spite of a most determined resistance on my part." — Vol. i. p. 111.

There is no difficulty in our accounting for the rejection of Romanism and Christianity both together, by a mind like Mr. White's. Nor can we wonder at the temporary concealment of his opinions. We learn from him that he was surrounded by dignitaries in the Church who made no secret with him of their infidelity, and even furnished him with skeptical works. They were content to reap the fruits of their hypocrisy. He was made wretched by his false position. By the laws of his country he cannot lay down his office. To expatriate himself is his only escape, and this will give a death-blow to his parents. Agitated by conflicting views, he strives to convince himself that he may honestly profess Christianity in an esoteric way — using his office only for good purposes and carefully avoiding any breach of morals. It is infinitely to his credit, that he is able to say, much later in life, that during the seven years of total unbelief in which he continued to exercise the office of a priest, he never availed himself of his privileges and opportunities for any purpose on which as a Christian he cannot look back without shame.

But let us not suppose him contented in this constrained hypocrisy, or wholly satisfied with the apologies he found for his concealment of his infidelity. He seeks the first opportunity, furnished by the civil and political disturbances in Spain, to fly his country. In a man with his tenderness of heart, his family ties, his peculiar unfitness to contend with the world, his sensitiveness,—this exile, which had no solace of fortune, of reputation, of companionship to alleviate it, was an act of heroism and principle, which ought to outweigh many faults, if there were many to be counterbalanced.

Of the trials that preceded his escape; of his sister's taking the veil, and by an unconscious refinement of torture, Arjona, a profligate to Blanco's knowledge, preaching the sermon on that dreadful occasion, and he an infidel being compelled to celebrate mass at what he regarded as his sister's sacrifice; of his horror of Catholicism, which has him so firmly in its murderous grasp; of his mother's fear lest she should be compelled to accuse him to the Inquisition;— of all these we have no time to speak.

He leaves Spain and arrives in England at the age of thirty-five, in the year 1810. There subsistence is the first thing to be thought of. He undertakes the Herculean labor of publishing a periodical of which he is the sole writer, devoted to the cause of political freedom in his own country. His honest services are met with an ingratitude and misrepresentation among the patriots at home, which wound him to the quick. He resists bribes, and threats of assassination, of which his political course makes him the object. His health breaks down under his great exertions, and the foundation is laid of a disease which gnaws at his vitals for the remainder of his life, and aggravates every trial to which he is called. From this time he is an invalid, and his ill health is a most important element in a just view of his character.

He tries private tutorship as a means of living, but is unable to bear the confinement and drudgery of this mode of life. Kind friends seem to have gathered about his path from the first, and his life in England is a history of great hospitality on the part of all who knew him. He is at different times the guest of various Episcopal clergymen, to whose character and kindness he bears most honorable testimony.

Blanco White's life in England, a period of thirty years, is interesting chiefly for the changes of religious opinion through which he passed. He arrived there an infidel; he shortly after renewed his faith in Christianity, and took orders in the English church.

His infidelity did not grow out of doctrinal difficulties. He rejected Christianity from an inability to believe in Romanism as a system. "Into the *authority* of that Church," he "resolved the certainty of his faith as a Christian." "When therefore," he says, "I became thorough-

ly convinced that Revelation did not give mankind the means of infallible certainty in regard to its supposed disclosures, I had no more to do with the body of theological doctrines. Why should I trouble myself any more with questions on the Trinity, Incarnation, and original sin." His return to Christianity arose chiefly "from examining it anew, not as a collection of dogmatic propositions, but in its spirit and tendencies; from studying it in the character of its Founder and his immediate followers." His mind "gave a *provisional* assent" to all the popular doctrines, and he of course found himself "predisposed to be a Church-of-England man." At this time, it is clear that doctrinal theology had formed no part of his studies. In subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles, he reëmbraced the religion of his birth and education, relieved of the errors which had alone caused him to abandon it.

It was in the conscientious endeavor to prepare himself for communion in the English Church and for orders, that Mr. White found out how much more deeply than he himself had known were his religious difficulties seated. His mind during the period of his infidelity had allowed itself free scope. He had acquired habits of bold and unfettered thought, and when he came to apply to dogmatical theology the strength and the liberty, which had been nourished in other studies, it was impossible for him to be satisfied with the theology of the Thirty-nine Articles. His private journals exhibit the struggles of his mind during the whole period of his connexion with the Establishment. He makes the most honest and earnest endeavors to cherish that pious frame of mind, which accepts without questioning whatever is favorable to devotion. His sympathies move him to emulate the pietistic faith of many kind and holy friends of the Evangelical Episcopal School, who concerned themselves deeply for his welfare. His strong desire for identification with a reputable and learned body of clergy, is a snare for his soul. Gratitude for the hospitality he had received from Episcopal quarters and his intimate friendship with some of the dignitaries who most honor the English Church, bind him to its faith. But he early begins to dissent from the narrowness and exclusiveness of its ecclesiastical measures. He is offended with the political endowment of a particular creed. He sees many of the worst features

of Romanism practically manifested in the English Church; and long before he has any distinct doubts about dogmas, protests against the discipline and pretensions of the Establishment. If his mind had not been exceedingly occupied at this period in the preparation of those remarkable works (judging by the effect they produced) which were directed against Romanism — we mean "Doblado's Letters," "Evidences against Catholisim," the "Poor Man's Preservative against Popery," — he would have sooner found out the state of his mind in regard to the theology of the English Church. The writing of these works did a great deal towards maturing his opinions and preparing him to dispute the truth of the popular theology.

It was, however, at a period when his mind was most devout, that he began to doubt the popular doctrines of the Atonement and the Trinity.

"The history of my mind affords frequent and clear proofs, that the resistance of my reason against every religious view which does not stand on grounds that will bear an accurate examination, though it may be occasionally checked, cannot be finally subdued by devotional feeling.— I was at this time, and had been for a long period, living like an ascetic, and striving with all my strength to follow the practices, and imbibe the spirit of persons whom I conceived to be far, far above me as Christians. My Common Place Book, at this period, attests in every page the prostration of my self-esteem, and the awe with which at times I struck my understanding. At this very time, nevertheless, and while I was most sincerely ready to expose my life for the sake of Christ's Gospel — at that very time, my daily reading and reflections were constantly raising doubts on the theological doctrines of the Atonement and the Trinity — doubts, indeed, which after long and fierce struggles with myself gained a complete victory." — Vol. i. p. 323.

We cannot enter into the particulars of his conversion to Unitarianism. It was only after long study, and patient reading of all that had been written upon the subject, with an anxious desire for the removal of his doubts, only after many successive haltings at the various intermediate steps, that he finally abandoned Orthodoxy and embraced Unitarian sentiments. It was against all his interests, his prejudices, his friendships. The struggle by which he brought himself to acknowledge to his own heart his change of opinions, and finally to confess it to the world, was almost a death-

struggle. It cost him a second expatriation. He left the home in Archbishop Whately's family, where his weary, exiled heart had found the most affectionate sympathy and repose, and where he had hoped to pass the short remainder of his suffering days, and threw himself again a stranger upon the world. It is proper to add, that although Mr. White's sense of propriety would not allow him to shelter his heresy under the Archbishop's roof, the conduct of the Whatelys was most tender, generous and Christian from the beginning to the end of their intercourse with him.

The relief, the freedom, the satisfaction which Blanco White enjoyed in his adoption of Unitarian sentiments, and his delight in the public ministrations of that faith, form almost the only era of peaceful happiness in his history. His way *to* this position is difficult and long;* his way *from* it is dark and full of unhappiness. Here for a moment he rests in what seemed to be his proper place. Would he could have felt his right to take up a permanent abode on that ground, so sacred and dear to us! The opinions to which he finally came, we cannot say in which he rested, are fully made known and discussed in the article in our last number to which we have referred.

It is impossible for any one who reads these volumes to doubt that he was governed by the sincerest love of truth in every change of sentiment he made. Indeed, a fear of unfaithfulness to his intellectual convictions haunted him with morbid apprehensions, and unquestionably tended to vitiate his investigations.

The studies of the last few years of his life, when his opinions underwent so painful a change, were carried on in a condition of bodily infirmity and suffering which it is most afflicting to contemplate. His natural sensibilities were extremely acute, and they had been sharpened still further by disease. The desertion and coldness of his former friends, or the manner in which his opinions were necessarily viewed by them, if they did not sour, certainly warped his mind. They made him jealous of all concessions to which his af-

* We are satisfied that a collection of the arguments which Blanco White furnishes against Orthodox errors, would prove a most valuable contribution to controversial literature, and we hope at least to see a tract, composed of extracts from these volumes bearing on the Unitarian controversy, added to the series of the Unitarian Association.

fections inclined him; jealous of the exercise of every faculty but the understanding. He set about his religious investigations with a prejudice against every opinion which harmonized with the sentiments of others. The enthusiasm which he dreaded so much in religion, was too constituent a part of him, not to appear in his endeavors to explode religious errors. He became, without suspecting it, an enthusiast in free-thinking; bigoted against bigotry, credulous in whatever favored incredulity. We are satisfied that his suspicion of the biases of his affections and temperament drove him into an opposite extreme, and subtracted from him all the assistance which the heart gives to the reasoning powers. He exhibits more acuteness than comprehensiveness of mind; more power to overthrow than to build up.

Blanco White, however, was a man of a very high order of mind, as well as of the utmost strength of character. When we consider how he disentangled himself from the subtleties and prejudices of Romanism, we do not wonder that his strength was exhausted in that struggle, and that the action of his mind was in some respects vitiated by mental and bodily effort, anxiety and disease, during the last few years of his most suffering life. He had passed through enough to break down any mind, and we cannot consider him as wholly sound in judgment or feeling during his concluding studies.

His natural abilities appear in the facility and extent of his acquirements, in his extraordinary proficiency in the English language, and the variety and thoroughness of his accomplishments. He was a thorough musician, a good classical scholar, no mean poet, a most accomplished narrator, as his biography proves, and a master of the idiom and eloquence of a foreign tongue, and that the English.

But it is his character which must excite the admiration of all capable of appreciating moral courage, inflexible rectitude and supreme devotion to truth. These qualities attracted to him the reverence and love of some of the best minds on this side the Atlantic, and on the Continent, while he lived. The painful conclusions to which he came did nothing to lessen the estimation in which he was held. Nay, he could not have exhibited his moral rectitude as completely as he did, had he not run into errors which

exposed him to almost universal suspicion and denunciation. He was faithful to conscience when it led him into deserts so dreary that God never designed his children should wander in them, and kept his integrity when deprived of supports which Heaven usually vouchsafes to virtue in its extremity. Without any of the encouragements or solaces which religion lends its disciples, he was still religious to the end. He accepted the duties, when stripped of the supports of faith. Believing in nothing that could sustain his delicate affections or encourage his fainting heart, he manifested a sublime fidelity to conscience to the last, and died a saint, without the faith or hope of a Christian.

What Blanco White did believe, he believed with all his heart. It was in the sanctity of virtue. What a mighty buoyancy must that sentiment possess, to have borne him up under the terrible doubts and disbeliefs which hung upon his expiring soul! Who does not honor Blanco White more in his spiritual integrity and shattered faith, than though with the completest faith he had wanted a ray only of his moral brightness? Thank God, there is no necessary connexion between his infidelity and his moral elevation. But let those who are not so unfortunately circumstanced as to be tried with his doubts, see to it that, with all their helps, they possess something of his integrity and martyr-like fidelity to duty.

It is impossible for us to do anything more than refer to the deeply interesting correspondence contained in these volumes, between Blanco White and Dr. Channing, Professor Norton, and other distinguished men. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of expressing the admiration we feel for the courage, simplicity, and modesty with which Mr. Thom has edited these volumes. None who have not read them, can appreciate the temptation he must have withstood to qualify or comment upon parts of the autobiography. We thank him for all he has done, and for all he has left undone. H. W. B.

Art. VI.—FESTUS.

A Poem of which the brave and earnest corn-law rhymer, Elliot, could say, "it contains poetry enough to set up fifty poets," must be an extraordinary work; and the author is certainly a most remarkable man, if at the age of twenty-three he has actually won the high position which a critic, not prone to overpraise, has assigned to him, in saying, that "Wordsworth excepted, who belongs to the past generation, there are but two living poets in England, Taylor and Tennyson, who can be named *near* him." Still higher is the praise bestowed in the assertion, that "in splendor and power, as sure as the sun shines, this poem cannot be outdone in the English tongue, thus far, short of Milton." Such a book may not be slighted. It was made known to readers in this country some four years since by an admirable review in the *Dial*, of which it is a sufficient recommendation, that it has been acknowledged in England, as the most discriminating and justly appreciating notice that has yet appeared. Now we have, thanks to Mr. Mussey, an edition reprinted here, and all who love good books will own and study it.

We are willing for our own part to confess, here in the outset, that taking Festus for all in all, we regard it as unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled by any creation of genius in the light literature of our age. This is a strong statement, but it is calmly made; and a thorough acquaintance with the book will, we are confident, establish the correctness of this judgment. We regret that space and time do not permit the full criticism which such a master-piece merits. But we must content ourselves with brief hints.

Our poet shall introduce himself.

L'Envoi.

"Read this, world! He who writes is dead to thee,
But still lives in these leaves. He spake inspired:
Night and day, thought came unhelped, undesired,
Like blood to his heart. The course of study he

* *Festus. A Poem.* By Philip James Bailey, Barrister at Law. First American Edition. Boston: B. B. Mussey. 1845. 16mo. pp. 416.

Went through was of the soul-rack. The degree
He took was high: it was wise wretchedness.
He suffered perfectly, and gained no less
A prize than, in his own torn heart, to see
A few bright seeds: he sowed them — hoped them truth.
The autumn of that seed is in these pages.
God was with him, and bade old Time, to the youth,
Unclench his heart, and teach the book of ages.
Peace to thee, world! — farewell! May God the Power,
And God the Love — and God the Grace, be ours!" — p. 413.

With such a book as this in hand one wishes to be, as the mesmerisers say, "impressible." We would not dare to touch it with coldness and cavilling; but would approach it with awe, as if laying our finger on the very heart of the writer. It is a confession in the ear of humanity; a pouring out of the soul's most holy secrets as at a judgment-day; a prayer in the temple of the all-present witness. We would let the author's "sphere" possess us. We would, for the time, see with his eyes, think with his mind, feel the impulse of his passions. Thus only, by looking on this self-portrait "in the same light in which it was drawn and colored," as Festus himself says, can we estimate aright his struggles, his personal limitations, God's work of wonder in him.

The first, superficial, outside impression of Festus Bailey, for the author and the book are wholly one, is of his extremely quick sensibility, and of his prodigal expenditure of life. The creature is all nerve; he feels with agonising intensity both pleasure and pain, and seems to be consuming, to use his own image,

"Like a bright wheel, which burns itself away,
Benighting even night with its grim limbs." — p. 76.

No poem of any time or language has manifested greater keenness of sensation. It would be impossible by extracts to give any notion of the profuse allusion to beauty of all kinds and degrees, with which this characteristic sensibility has crowded every page. As well attempt by a handful of wild flowers to represent the luxuriance of a western prairie, or pluck icicles from glittering boughs and shrubs to image the lustre of woods and fields changed to a magic garden by a winter's rain. The *temperament* of the man is in the highest scale of the poetic; he is a genuine child

of nature. Such excess of rapture is indeed morbid. Yet it would be better never to have been born, than not to have experienced the passionate love of mere existence, which exclaims with Festus,

> "I ask for nought
> * * * but this, — to lie
> And look, and live, and *bask*, and bless myself
> Upon thy broad, bright bosom." — p. 52.
> "Green, dewy Earth, who standest at my feet
> Singing, and *pouring sunshine on thy head*
> *As naiad native water*, speak to me!
> I am thy son." — p. 61.

As an illustration of his childlike exuberance of natural delight, take Clara's words: —

> "How still the air is! the tree-tops stir not:
> But stand and peer on Heaven's bright face as though
> It slept and they were loving it: they would not
> Have the skies see them move for summers; would they?
> See that sweet cloud! It is watching us, I am certain.
> What have we here to make thee stay one second?
> Away! thy sisters wait thee in the west,
> The blushing bridemaids of the sun and sea.
> I would I were like thee, thou little cloud,
> Ever to live in Heaven: or seeking earth,
> To let my spirit down in drops of love:
> To sleep with night upon her dewy lap;
> And, the next dawn, back with the sun to heaven;
> And so on through eternity, sweet cloud!
> I cannot but think that some senseless things
> Are happy. Often and often have I watched
> A gossamer line sighing itself along
> The air, as it seemed; and so thin, thin and bright,
> Looking as woven in a loom of light,
> That I have envied it, I have, and followed; —
> Oft watched the sea-bird's down blown o'er the wave,
> Now touching it, now spirited aloft,
> Now out of sight, now seen, — till in some bright fringe
> Of streamy foam, as in a cage, at last
> A playful death it dies, and mourned its death."—pp. 69, 70.

It is quite observable however, that the eye and touch in Bailey are so dominant, that the ear has but small chance to glean its share of pleasure. The allusions are but few and slight to music, though occasionally sweetly significant,

as where Helen prattles to her lute, (p. 282.) But he does not seem fully *alive*, as he is elsewhere, to the ineffable harmony which underlies and binds in concord all relations of existence. The profound mystery of sounds apparently has not been opened to him. And his saying, that

> "the voice of great
> Or graceful thoughts is sweeter far than all
> Word-music,"

neither explains nor excuses his evident indifference to rhythm and melody in his verse. But his eye is marvellously all-seeing. Such comprehensiveness and accuracy, rapidity and depth of vision give glorious omen of what our bodily existence, when pure and perfect, will be. And his touch, whether passive to receive influences by contact or active in motion, is wondrously delicate and vigorous. He drinks in joy at every pore and thrills to his extremities. The heaving of billows, the rush of winds, the whirl of tempests, the floating of sunny clouds, the swoop of the eagle, the glancing lightness of the swallow, the swaying of branches, the plunge of floods, the wide-circling curves of worlds in their orbits, the ceaseless changes of movement in living things, do not outweary, but only fulfil the longing of this restless sense. He is all but winged, or upborne by the spirit. Take as an obvious instance of this his ride around the earth, pp. 101–112.

His faculty of "out-sight"— to borrow a word that felicitously expresses his quick instinct of observation — appears equally in relation to man and man's doings. As a slight example take this: —

> "Yon tall slim tree! does it not seem as made
> For its place there, a kind of natural maypole? —
> Beyond, the lighted stalls stored with the good
> Things of our childhood's world, and behind them,
> The shouting showman and the clashing cymbal;
> The open doored cottages and blazing hearth,—
> The little ones running up with naked feet,
> And cake in either hand, to their mother's lap, —
> Old and young laughing, schoolboys with their play-things,
> Clowns cracking jokes, and lasses with sly eyes,
> And the smile settling in their sunflecked cheeks,
> Like noon upon the mellow apricot." — p. 112.

Again, this instant and infallible accuracy of perception appears in his style. His nouns and epithets have a more than daguerreotyped, fac-simile, Chinese copy, resemblance to the original. They are alive with meaning. He but describes his own habit of using language when he says so well, —

> " The dress of words,
> Like to the Roman girl's enticing garb,
> Should let the play of limb be seen through it,
> And the round, rising form. A mist of words,
> Like halos round the moon, though they enlarge
> The seeming size of thoughts, make the light less
> Doubly. It is the thought writ down we want,
> Not its effect — not likenesses of likenesses.
> And such descriptions are not, more than gloves
> Instead of hands to shake, enough for us." —p. 283.

Yet more this trait appears in his exhaustless wealth of metaphor; and surely such magnificence of symbol has not been seen in any writer of our day. Like a king, he scatters "largesse" of exquisite coins and medallions on every side as he rides out of his palace. Here indeed we pass beyond the *temperament* of the poet to his *intellect.* The artist is he who harmoniously and proportionately blends perception and imagination; who sees and feels how earth and heaven, matter and spirit, are forever newly married with the wedding ring of beauty. To lively senses the poet adds the awful consciousness of the symbolic, of unity in variety. And in Festus Bailey this is fully done. He knows that he is dwelling in a temple, where, from the pavement to the dome, every mosaic, curtain, rafter, column is stamped with the image of the Infinite God. Correspondencies do not delight his *fancy*, they overflow his spirit by their grandeur and unfathomable significance. To him God, man, nature are mystically analogous to one another. He has powerfully described this sublime experience, that to the poet the universe is but one endlessly diversified image of the Infinite in the finite, by saying,

> " All things talked thoughts to him. The sea went mad,
> And the wind whined as 't were in pain, to shew
> Each one his meaning; and the awful sun
> Thundered his thoughts into him; and at night

The stars would whisper theirs, the moon sigh hers.
The spirit speaks all tongues and understands;
Both God's and angel's, man's and all dumb things,
Down to an insect's inarticulate hum
And an inaudible organ. And it was
The spirit spake to him of everything;
And with the moony eyes like those we see,
Thousands on thousands, crowding air in dreams,
Looked into him its mighty meanings, till
He felt the power fulfil him, as a cloud
In every fibre feels the forming wind." — pp. 254, 255.

Would that we had time to extract a few of his startlingly fresh and brilliant images; but every line surprises one by rich allusion, as in fairy land one might find under each stone a buried treasure. In wonderful transmutation, at his bidding, all brutal, vegetable semblances resume their higher form of human affections, and pass sublimed into heaven, as angels of God. He rightly says,

"Without faith,
Illimitable faith, * * *
* * * in God, no bard can be.
All things are signs of other and of nature.
It is at night we see heaven moveth, and
A darkness thick with suns. The thoughts we think
Subsist the same in God as stars in heaven." — p. 257.

But we are dwelling too long on the mere nature of the poet, and must pass to deeper impressions. And at once we are made aware of the youthfulness and of the premature wisdom of this poem. It is a very paradise of youth, rank, wild, exuberant; its airs laden with perfume, its meadows tangled with flowers, its groves weighed down with fruit; where the dancing seasons whirl so swiftly, that spring crowns winter with her wreath of buds. A fuller expression was never given of that untamed, heroic age, when the universe discloses its secrets to the charm of unsated, unbroken hope; when the drama of humanity opens scene beyond scene of its majestic spectacle, and romance after romance, each more brilliant than the other in attire, more bewildering in masquerade, more piquant in pantomime, crowds upon the stage; when with brain illuminated by waking visions, more bright than opium dreams, the youth feels born to be a king, a meet companion for

angels, a name among the nations, an unexhausted influence of good to renovate the earth. The sound, full-breathing lungs, the elastic muscles, the buoyant spring of tireless limbs, the sense of overflowing life, dashing through dangers, scaling all barriers, unconscious of peril, heedless of failure, inspire each page. How glossy with newness every thought; how full of oxygen its spirits; how unabashed its aspiration and conjecture; how at home in the world it is, as heir apparent in the Father's palace. This book indeed reveals

> "the mind of youth
> In strengths and failings, in its overcomings,
> And in its short comings; the kingly ends,
> The universalizing heart of youth;
> Its love of power, heed not how had, although
> With surety of self-ruin at the end." — p. 277.

And yet this joyousness is but a lingering sweetness in the garments, and a fast fainting echo of a Paradise Lost. For brooding, damp melancholy obscures already waste deserts of ennui. Youth is sad oftentimes from finding no outlet for its energies, when pent-up passions stagnate; and yet nobler youth is sadder at the shuddering consciousness of contrast between its Olympic ideal and the pigmy seeming facts of common life; but Festus, alas! is sad from sin.

We would read with tenderest delicacy this

> "tear-blistered letter,
> Which holdeth fruit and proof of deeper feeling
> Than the poor pen can utter, or the eye
> Discover," — (p. 250)

this study of his life, this diary; and yet how avoid mention of what is *most central* in the book. Youth should garner and invest, — to speak in the language of our business age, — not prodigally expend Heaven's legacy of feeling. The spendthrift becomes a beggar; the voluptuary a cynic; the sentimentalist a misanthrope. Only he who uses affection gratefully, as a trust, is ever freshly inspired with the overflowing bounty of goodness. We should not be proudly exclusive, not arrogantly lonely; but should tolerate, forbear, sacrifice, share unweariedly, however tame, disgusting, stupid, seem the half-waked beings round us. It

is by incarnating in reverential, courteous, gentle deeds, these angel hopes and visions, not by contemplations and self-concentered raptures, that youth matures into symmetric godliness of manhood. Dear Festus! did not thy after sins grow out of *friendlessness!* Do we break the crystal partitions of respect, which guard spirits from spirits, in speaking thus? If so, pardon!

But dost thou say,

> "My virtue is indulgence, I was born
> To gratify myself unboundedly;
> So that I wronged none else." —p. 243.

Hast thou not wronged *thyself*, and so wronged others, by not believing, what all tradition teaches, that strength is proved, as the world now is, by self-denial, and that dignity is now kept only by decorum? That "poor, trite thing called moderation" is, in this winter of man's existence, the husk to guard the flower from blight. We are "members one of another;" and *conscience* (Con-Science) means a corresponding knowledge of duty with others, a law of right reflected in society from the great central light of law in God's essential love. Unchecked impulse can be beautiful, only when all around us and when we ourselves are retransformed into God's likeness, and when by pervading inspiration of the Divine life innumerable varieties of character are harmonized in one grand concert of thanksgiving. The way to that *transfiguration* is by perfect obedience, not by lawlessness. Man will be man when "earth shall come of age;" and then in a universal chorus of "Gloria in excelsis" the freest voice shall be sweetest. But bear humbly thy limitations *now*. So only can any mortal as yet be pure, and without purity we are open sport to the legion of devils. God's spirit deserts the tabernacle, when from our drunken cups we spill our lusts upon his temple-floor.

And by this sadness over the undenied, the openly avowed fact, that such a noble nature as Festus has stooped to folly and meanness, and has been selfish, where any one deserving the name of man should be only, always and forever generous, we are led to yet deeper impressions of this wonderful poem. Inexpressibly touching are the words, so dreadfully true as we feel them to be, of the original,

"Yet with as kind a heart as ever beat,
He was no sooner made than marred. Though young,
He wrote amid the ruins of his heart;
They were his throne and theme; — *like some lone king,*
Who tells the story of the land he lost,
And how he lost it."

* * * * *

"Nor did he think enough, till it was over,
How bright a thing he was breaking, or he would
Surely have shunned it, nor have let his life
Be *pulled to pieces like a rose by a child.*" — pp. 250, 251.

This impetuous, proud, splendid boy was indeed tempted by Lucifer. The great adversary was no picture, but a tremendous reality to him. And the theology which fills this poem, is like a crucifix that has been pressed to the bosom till it is bloody. The whole book is a struggle for salvation, of one who felt himself to be a chosen minister,

"Whose firmest prop and highest meaning was
The hope of serving God as poet-priest;" — p. 8.

who might have been a "sun-mind" to

"Have warmed the world
To love and worship and bright life;" — p. 31.

and yet upon whom "the insipidity of innocence had palled," and who had basely bowed

To make *his young heart's track upon the first,*
And snow-like fall of feeling which o'erspreads
The bosom of the youthful maiden's mind;" — p. 50.

and in just recompense whose heart "had broken inwards, to its central hell."

"Dark, wretched thoughts, like ice-isles in a stream,
Choke up his mind and clash; — and to no end.
There comes this question, over and over again,
Driven into the brain as a pile is driven —
What shall become of us hereafter." — p. 369.

"Like snow, which lies
Down-wreathed round the lips of some black pit,
Thoughts which obscure the truth accumulate,
And those which solve it, in it lose themselves." — p. 370.

He will spell out the hieroglyphic of *Evil,* not, scholastically calm, by the peat fire of buried dogmas, but, with agony of spirit, by the dazzling conflagration of his own

temple of peace. "Thank God, he is a man, and no philosopher." And so the religion of this book becomes livingly interesting; and to ourselves we gladly admit most suggestive, and full of instruction.

Its theology is the most thorough-going, ultra Calvinism, which the world perhaps has ever heard uttered. Its logic is as exact as that of Edwards or Hopkins in this country, or that of Dr. Williams in England; and with all deference we should say, that it is far more exact. For its doctrine is simply this; — that all finite creatures, necessarily, as the opposites of Infinite perfection, sin; that their existence and their sin is for the manifestation, and as a part of the manifestation, of God's glory; that evil therefore is the Deity's appointed means of revealing his goodness, at once by contrast with it, and by redeeming, absorbing, transmuting, glorifying it; that God, by creating, pledges his mercy and love for all the consequences of creation; and that the consummation of all things therefore is forever and forever an ineffable blessedness. Grant the main doctrine of *necessity*, and where is the broken link in this golden chain which thus binds all worlds to heaven?

Festus is the boldest, most uncompromising advocate of the doctrine, that

> "Nothing can be antagonist to God." — p. 13.

To him

> "Free will is but necessity in play,—
> *The clattering of the golden reins which guide*
> *The thunder-footed coursers of the sun.*" — ib.

It is conclusive then, as he so strongly says, that

> "He only hath free will, whose will is fate." — ib.

Again he is consistent in his avowed Pantheism, which runs like a vein of thought under his whole book, breaking here and there into light; or rather, like an ocean of air transparently enspheres it, and at seasons condensing into clouds, distils pure drops of meaning. He says that

> "Life
> Doth necessarily result from God,
> As thought and outward action from ourselves.
> * * * * * * * *
> He acts through all in all; the truth we know,
> He doth himself inbreathe." — pp. 10, 11.

It is interesting to see how Bailey thus responds to the prevalent philosophy of our age, at once in what is best and what is worst in it. He draws the same sublime moral which Spinoza, and all his long train of scholars who have known their own meaning, have drawn.

> "Let each man think himself an act of God,
> His mind a thought, his life a breath of God,
> *And let each try, by great thoughts and good deeds,*
> *To show the most of Heaven he hath in him.*" — p. 11.

And he confesses to the same weakness in the *motive* for thus trying; for why do or attempt to do, what only God can do? Surely virtue is an absurd, inconsequential weakness. Heaven shall not "send temptation to our hearts in vain," p. 64. We will wring out the heart of the grand secret of Eternity, in his own appointed way, if so it must be, by *remorse.*

> "My spirit is on edge. I can enjoy
> Nought which has not the honied sting of sin;
> * * * * * * * *
> That wanton whetting of the soul, which while
> It gives a finer, keener edge for pleasure,
> Wastes more and dulls the sooner." — p. 30.

In plain English, goodness is goodness; "God is the great Necessity, and he is good;" evil is delusive, a night, a frost; so fear nothing, you cannot get out of God; yield full swing to desire; trust to nature; all will and must be well; and to crown the arch with the capstone, hell is but heaven inverted, and the devil is Deity in shadow. It is well thus blankly to state the whole doctrine, which a straight-forward intellect must deduce from the doctrine of Necessity. If we adopted the premises of Festus, we certainly should acknowledge ourselves to be at once Trinitarians and Universalists; and should fully subscribe to the profoundly affecting statement,

> "That God doth suffer for the sins of those
> Whom He hath made, that are liable to sin.
> *In all of us He hath His agony;*
> *We are the cross, and death of God, and grave.*" — p. 11.

But while acknowledging with humblest awe the unsolved, the insolvable mystery of a created will, of a finite force, we unhesitatingly assert it to be the profoundest experi-

ence of life, that man does exist as a *person;* not a slave under the law of fate, which is the necessity of nature; not at one with God in the law of liberty, which is the necessary freedom of Divine love; but free to obey and to cöoperate with the Spirit of holiness, free to aspire and receive of his fulness, and alas! free also to sink into the natural, the brutal, the far worse than brutal, and so become a devil incarnate. Above nature, beneath Heaven, man stands militant to reconquer a lost world from the fiends. As in a desperate Waterloo battle, every one should feel that his soul is the garden of Hougomont, upon the maintenance of which the fortunes of the day may turn; and so let him steadfastly say, 'I will not yield, nay, not one inch, oh Lucifer. God and good spirits help me. Amen.'

And now that we have through outworks and portcullis reached the very citadel of this fellow-mortal's soul, we would like much to enter deeply into his spirit. But there is space only to say, that Festus Bailey is of the grandest style of character. He is profoundly religious, not mawkishly, pulingly, but bravely pious. He is humane too in the largest sense. His heart beats with his race. The grand tide of love, which follows the sun around the earth in our generation, fills every bay and breaks in snowy billows on every beach of his large continent of thought. As a proof of it, read his glad hosanna over the redemption of the devils. He knows too that our passions are not to be driven like madmen with iron whips to under-ground dungeons, but to be led out into the air and sun, and cleansed and robed in white and crowned with flowers, and led up rejoicing to the temple of the universal Father. Indeed, this man is a prophet. No one in our day has hinted more of what the future will loudly declare. The scattered gleams of many thinkers gather to his hospitable palace, bearing torches to a common festival of hope. Let any one who would justify our assertion read, among other passages, the prayer which Festus offers on page 91. This man does *see,* does *speak the truth,* as few have ever dared to do. He does soar to the sun, although the two fiends of Voluptuousness and Arrogance do tear his Psyche wings, and stain his glory with their earthly slime. And although he too is sick with the slow fever of our time, which comes

from a thought far in advance of our action, the disease of subjectiveness and introspection, yet is he well enough to sit at the open casement, and breathe the fresh breezes of present inspirations. We rejoice to say he is a man of his own time and land.

And here we reluctantly leave, with the sense of having said nothing adequate, this revised vision of Heaven and Purgatory and Hell; this second edition of Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained; this resurrection of Faust and Mephistophiles; and as we raise our eyes from this absorbing poem, we seem to see the shades of Dante, Milton, Goëthe, gathered to look down upon this foster-child of theirs, who has made it his boyish pastime to spin worlds for his marbles, and who with wasteful over-confidence of strength dares to follow their shining track, and climb from sun to sun as golden steps to the central throne. Half smiling, half stern, they regard him. Dante, whose massive face the sorrows of fifty years have seamed, as floods gully the mountain sides, in whose eyes profound griefs lie dark and still like lakes in extinct craters, holds aloft the roll of the Commedia, as if to say, "Oh, youth of twenty summers, thou talkest of 'wise wretchedness!' My life-long mourning for my lady — my mismarriage, with its nameless blights — my battles, honors, exile, wanderings, poverty — my studies, prayers, and lonely contemplations at Santa Croce and Tolmino — my years of pent-up powers, — were the black, central orb which fed the fires of *this* sun of thought; and thou talkest of having 'suffered perfectly!' When thou hast bravely borne the trials of half a century, then dip thy pen again in the hoarded tears of a whole life, and write of Hell."

Milton, his long locks parted over rounded temples, like the curtains of a shrine, a benignant smile smoothing the lines of brow and cheek, like the sunset glow upon retiring storms, and with inward-looking gaze which turns to meet the rising morn of the spirit, waves his hand in benediction. "Sayest thou, oh little one, that 'the degree thou hast taken is high?' Years of classic study — travels and intercourse with noblest cotemporary minds — sacrifices of all life's prospects for conscience' sake among men who

'License meant, when they cried Liberty;'

aid of England's

> 'Chief of men, who through a cloud,
> Not of war only but detractions rude,
> Guided by faith and matchless fortitude,
> To peace and truth his glorious way had ploughed;'

the bating no jot of heart or hope when left alone in the dark world and wide, but

> 'Content, though blind, with soul more bent
> To serve therewith my Maker,'

forming an Eden out of chaos;—a life of consecration, oh Festus, taught me the skill to open the golden-hinged, harmonious gate of Heaven."

Then Göethe, with unruffled robes about a kingly form, covering beneath calm self-possession and stately courteousness his giant impulses, and with a glance of attic keenness penetrating all pretences, seems to raise a warning finger. "'Old Time' was bade to thee 'unclench his heart, and teach the book of ages.' Ah! my brave boy! old time will teach thee deeper wonders in this magnificent symbol of man's life upon earth. It is central heat under pressure, that converts lime-stone to marble, carbon to diamonds, and gases to gems. Wait; there will be many upheavals from thy nature yet. These early writings, mighty as their force is, are but sauri and mastodons. Not yet is thy blooming garden formed for godlike man to till and dwell in. Husband thy energies; concentrate them. Thou wouldst 'strike out a naked heart, a statued mind.' It may not be done; man's life is an embodiment of soul in beauty. Study Greece then and Grecian art; open thyself yet longer to Nature; learn to balance thy powers among the human interests of thy time and land; drill thy faculties in practical usefulness; learn to be as exact in details as large in scope; be humbler before the great deeds of the past, the greater tendencies of the present. Thou wilt know man better, when by long, patient, faithful self-renouncement among men, thou hast become more a Man."

Is the verdict just, which thy elder peers thus in imagination pass upon thee, oh Festus? Is it not all but an irreparable loss and waste of life to have written such a book thus early? Should not this fire of passion, this

aroma of piety, have been separated — the firmament from the firmament — and between them a character humble and heroic, loveful and loving, gentle and strong, have been formed, like a habitable earth for all human affections? We *will* not believe thy prophetic announcement of thy purposes,—

> "After that, like the burning peak, he fell
> Into himself, and was missing ever after." — p. 289.

Not so! Thy slumbering volcano-heats shall diffuse themselves to ripen grapes in many a vineyard for happy hands to crush. After this earthquake of expression thou hast settled into action. Thou art *Barrister at Law.* Good. Thou needest such repose, and such diversion. A tame, drudging, worldly actualist, thou canst never be,— as well make Pegasus a draft-horse truly; a visionary idealist, holding this world as a shadow and sham, pining for heaven before you have truly outlived earth, thou canst not be either, for flesh and blood, and will and thought are too energetic: then be a realist, whole-hearted, sound-headed, strong-handed in the present; and as the sun and earth and the powers of the whole universe concentre to perfect the fringe of the lowliest leaflet, and to ripen the tinniest seed, so be thy least act pregnant with a godlike greatness of devotion. Struggle for England's groaning masses like a hero; set on high the true aristocrats of usefulness; enthrone thy greatest on the throne of a reverent affection. Live the Poem thou hast tried to write. And so redeem Lucifer and his fallen hosts around thee, by being in thy look, tone, deeds, a Bearer of the Light, a Morning Star.

W. H. C.

Art. VII.—REV. JONATHAN FARR.

For some twenty years last past, from time to time, the public have been favored with a succession of earnest, unpretending little works; some containing only a few leaves, and some swelling into the size of books; some with, and some without the name of the author. In all they amount to twenty-three or four. They are of various merit and on various subjects — the productions of a mind in some re-

spects singularly constituted and of a heart that beat in the right place. Some of them are pervaded with a quaint, quiet humor, and are conceived in almost a poetical spirit; some are plain even to bluntness; and some are written with a touching simplicity, from which passages might be quoted that move to tears. Their very titles are characteristic. They are "Gospel Temperance"—"Religious Curiosity"—"Religious Log Book,"—composed in an earnest religious tone. Then we have "Plain Letters on Important Subjects,"—plain enough, but not without a spice of shrewdness, good sense, and poetry. It is not every man that could sketch so accurately the petty annoyances which the system of proselytism and exclusion has left in many an united and peaceful family, and no mind which had not a dash of poetry could conceive of writing a letter to the venerable Dr. Watts and execute it so well. We have "First Pastoral Letter to the dear People of my Charge,"—just such an epistle as every minister should carry in his heart. Then there are "Sermons designed to teach plainly the Doctrines of the Gospel and earnestly to enforce the Precepts of Jesus Christ;" the touching sketches, "Trials of Mr. Loraine's Faith," "Mr. Loraine's Faith Examined and Changed," and "The Sunday School Teacher's Funeral;" "Counsels and Consolations;" "Family Prayers."

We said these productions are of various merit. They all have this merit;—they treat on subjects that at the time engrossed the public mind; they met the exact difficulty that was felt, and are exactly adapted to the class of plain, unlettered readers for whom they were intended. Some of them rise to a high degree of excellence. They contain touches of the truest simplicity and pathos. There are passages in "Mr. Loraine's Faith," his "Faith Examined and Changed," and the "Sunday School Teacher's Funeral," of extreme tenderness. We never read them without emotion. Those scenes in the old country church are a transcript of real scenes that occurred in more than one New England village thirty years ago. There were minds at that period, which in passing from the stern doctrines of Calvin to a more liberal faith went through a fearful struggle, and the transition awakened some of the deepest and most delightful emotions. It was as when men at once emerge from a cold, damp, and tangled forest, where a few fitful beams

steal, into broad and sunny fields. The imagination glows and the heart is touched by the change; and all nature is robed anew. The skies are of a deeper blue, and the fields of a livelier green. So, again, that touching picture of the Sunday teacher's funeral. It is true and beautiful and tender. They who have lived long in a retired country village, who have shared in the feelings which prevail where every countenance, and every family history is familiar, and have witnessed the sensation there created by the death of the young, lovely and devoted, can appreciate its power. The doctrinal discourses, we know, gave relief to many for whom they were written; and the "Counsels and Consolations" and "Family Prayers" we have more than once seen in remote farm-houses, laid upon the family Bible, to be read when the memory of the buried child came back afresh, or to be rehearsed at the family altar in the morning and evening sacrifice.

But whatever be the merit of these productions, the mind that conceived them has passed away from among us; the hand that penned them moulders in the grave. On a fair afternoon the last summer, a funeral procession was seen winding its way to a secluded spot in a village graveyard, a circle of kindred and friends was drawn around the grave, and there, in the quiet hour, amid the serene aspects of nature, were committed to the earth the mortal remains of the author. But there were mourners who were not there. For their sakes, for the sake of those who would know more of one who deserves well of his brethren and friends, we propose to devote a few pages to such notices of him as we have been able to collect.

Rev. Jonathan Farr was a native of Harvard, born September 20, 1790. His parents were respectable, but poor; and he enjoyed such opportunities only of early education as were afforded by a country school as it then was, and no better prospects of success in life than were found in the humblest mechanical employment. He was early sent to the trade of a shoemaker, and in this business continued to work until past his majority. With what skill he could manufacture a shoe is not known; but it is remembered that he was then a lover of books, and possessed of a genial nature, was noted for that quaint humor, odd fancy, and downright honesty of purpose, which run so clearly through

his published works. As a shoemaker his prospects were not brilliant; and no doubt, as many in the same humble calling, more gifted than he, have done, he yearned for a higher and broader field of effort. But he honestly and faithfully labored in his employment through his appointed time. Among other places he worked in Ann Street in Boston. A few months before his death, for the first time, he again visited this ancient portion of our capital, and in a speech in the Seamen's Chapel, one evening, is said to have described with power and touching eloquence the physical and moral changes which he witnessed around him. He had seen poverty written on the doors of the dwellings, licentiousness and filth and rags stalking along the street; he now saw affluence and sobriety and comfort in all the habitations. A change had also passed over his own inward and outward life. He was then a raw country lad, verging into manhood, fresh from the freedom and fragrance of fields, touched with an ambition for intellectual and spiritual treasures; but denied, compelled by his necessity to bind himself to unintellectual pursuits — to breathe the unwholesome air of a shop in a crowded city, and to be the companion of rude, vicious men. He was there again, emancipated, with intellectual and moral tastes, a large circle of intelligent friends, and above all, with the consciousness that he had instructed, gratified and soothed many minds — had awakened interest and affection where he was personally unknown. Contrasts like these are oftener found than expressed. But whether expressed or not, they cause the current of grateful thought to flow more freely, and contribute their full share to fill the cup of pleasing remembrances.

Mr. Farr could not repress his desire of a liberal education; and the fact that he resolved to acquire one under circumstances which many would have regarded insurmountable, is proof enough that the desire was not faint and feeble. He was poor, without influential friends, in ill health, and advanced to a period of life when most young men have not only completed their academical education, but have entered on their profession. But by one so accustomed to self-denial all these obstacles were accounted as nothing. With him, to resolve was to execute. He placed himself under the care of Rev. Stephen Bemis,

minister of Harvard, and by him was prepared for Cambridge, where he was admitted in the large class of 1814.

His appearance at that time must have been strange enough to the young men who had come from the public schools, and were now to be his intimate associates through the four most important years of life. Almost twice their own age, with peculiar staidness and gravity of deportment, tall and gaunt in his form, unable from the emptiness of his purse and the scantiness of his wardrobe to improve an awkward exterior, he might at a first interview provoke a smile, but there was about him a straight-forwardness, a native shrewdness, a goodness of heart, that silenced the thoughtless tongue, and won respect and affection. He had now entered on a new scene of life, and circumstanced as he was — so advanced in life, in feeble health, with no aid or voice of encouragement from friends, with no pretensions to superior scholarship to compel attention and create friends — the attempt to pass through a regular course of study had something in it of rashness. But he felt he had that in him which was worth cultivating, and so he worked his way, we scarcely know how, through his College terms, and was graduated in the summer of 1818. This itself was no small achievement. The struggles of poor artists have become proverbial; the silent, uncomplaining sacrifices of the poor, ambitious student would form a chapter quite as affecting. The walls of old Harvard, if they could speak, would bear testimony to secret sufferings and a manly endurance with which no stranger can intermeddle.

From the College Mr. Farr passed to the Divinity School, having meanwhile been baptized and admitted to the church of the University by Dr. Kirkland; and his name appears, on the Catalogue, in the class which left that institution in 1821. He now entered on the duties of a profession which had been the crowning object of his ambition. But the pressure of poverty was still upon him. At a time when the great crisis of his life had come, when the ordeal of the world's opinion was to be passed, and the mind needed, if ever, composure and freedom from distracting care, he was harrassed by thoughts of the morrow — he was compelled to save and stint and starve. In a letter written a few weeks before his death, twenty-five years after the period

to which he refers, he incidentally alludes to the straits to which he was driven by his necessities. There is something touching in the account. The letter is one of acknowledgment for a present of writing paper and materials, which he had received from a friend. "I feel," he says, "rich in this large addition to my stationary. When I commenced writing sermons, I was so penniless that I went to a bookbinder's and bought a lot of shreds of paper, which are torn out of the beginning and end of books while binding. On such many of my first sermons were written; and now I have half a ream of paper at a time! Think of that!" We have heard the young students and preachers from our Theological School charged with extravagance. They are supposed to live in ease and fare sumptuously every day. There are those whose imaginations picture them reclining on sofas, and penning their dainty thoughts on gilt and scented paper. There was one at least who did not greatly sin in this way.

Mr. Farr was never a popular preacher. His sermons were good and true and practical, written in a serious, fervent spirit; but lacking energy of manner, he ordinarily was not able to awaken much interest. We have heard him on occasions, when he spoke with a simple, fervid eloquence that touched all hearts; but he had not the requisite qualities for an orator. And so he was little sought by congregations in quest of a candidate for the ministry. His probation was long. The patriarch served seven years before he reared his family tent; our friend served nine years at the altar before he received a "call" and became the minister of a parish. In the meantime he preached from place to place — a Sabbath here and a month there. There was scarcely a country congregation that was not familiar with his person and voice. His life was literally a pilgrimage. But he toiled and travelled on with cheerfulness and good hope, and bore his lot meekly and patiently.

At length he received an invitation, and was ordained over the first parish in Gardner, Mass., December 9, 1830. Here he hoped to have found a resting-place. He set his his house in order. He married, and laid wide his plans for a permanent abode and lasting usefulness. It is true, the parish was small in numbers and not rich in resources;

but his wants were few — and he loved to labor among simple, unlettered people. In his parochial relations he seems to have been faithful and devoted. He preached to them wholesome truths on the Sabbath, and was frequent among them on the week-day, and tasked his ability to do his work thoroughly and well. Some of his plans were quite original. He annually addressed to his flock words of counsel in the form of a general epistle, and having printed, distributed them from house to house. These are the "Pastoral Letters to the dear People of my Charge," the primitive simplicity of whose titles is significant of the tender, affectionate spirit in which they are written.

But he had fallen on evil times, if not on evil tongues. The tie between pastor and people, once so sacred, had become the frailest of all mortal ties. And the connexion from which he promised himself so much of usefulness and happiness, continued but a little more than two years and a half. It was dissolved June 30, 1833; and he was again sent adrift upon the world — now with a young and dependent family, not knowing whither to direct his steps. There are those both among the ministry and the people, who indulge in loose notions on this subject, who talk lightly of severing a tie consecrated in all ages by the most solemn rites — once deemed among the most endearing and enduring relations. If there are not fidelity and sympathy and affection, let it be severed: the sooner, the better. But where these are found to exist, a separation is not to be thought of. It inflicts a positive injury; it interrupts the subtle current of association and feeling, on which the religious life so much depends; it costs a pang in many hearts which few events in a long life ever occasion. If our ministers would but reflect what power an established character gives to their words — if our people would but consider how much better able to serve them is he who has known them long and well, this would be one of the last of human ties ever severed. But we speak of times a dozen years ago. We are glad to believe that both ministers and people are returning to a more just appreciation of the relation between them.

Mr. Farr once more retired with his family to his native village, and embraced such precarious means of support as he could find. He again took up the pilgrim's staff, and

wherever there was a call to preach, he was always ready to stand in his lot. But from year to year younger men arose to take his place, and these calls were more and more infrequent. He preached however occasionally; and at the period of his last illness he was on the point of leaving his home for the temporary supply of a distant pulpit.

But, on the whole, his ministerial life must be regarded as a failure. The great object to which he had devoted his best days, for which he had struggled in poverty and loneliness and sickness, was never accomplished. The success which had shone like a radiant orb upon his hopes in the darkest night of his discouragement, he never reached. He failed in the great end of his life, and he felt that he had. As a minister he had never produced the impression upon the public which he coveted. He possessed a loving spirit, and would have established himself in the hearts of numerous parishioners and friends. He would have cemented the relation by years of faithful labors. He would have been followed to his grave by a mourning congregation, and gladly have slept the sleep of death in the midst of them.

But he had failed. He would have served in a welcoming pulpit — it was the throne to which his ambition aspired; but his services had been rejected, and in his failure there was a trial which they only know who are disappointed in long cherished plans. It was a trial which he keenly felt. It cast a shadow on his spirit. It was a dark period of his life. There was nothing more to hope, and many would have sat down in helpless despair. But it is the period which we contemplate with most of gratitude and admiration; for we behold in him an inward power which never till then was fully developed. He never yielded to outward discomfiture, but, instead, was aroused to renewed exertion. The more he failed without, the more he struggled for intellectual and spiritual attainments. It was the period of his intensest mental activity, his most disinterested devotion. Early and late he sat at his studies, and counted the moments lost which were not spent in the acquisition of knowledge. He reviewed his classical studies, and made no inconsiderable progress in modern languages. He went over again the field of theology and communed with the master spirits of sacred literature. He gathered around

him the authors of the earlier English age, and in some unfinished essays found among his manuscripts the spirit of Owen Feltham himself seems to have returned to dwell among us. "I am rarely from home," he writes, "any evening, and I am generally in my study Sabbath evenings. I am so now. I have attended church forenoon and afternoon. I have read the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, French, German, modern Greek, and English, and two chapters in Thomas à Kempis in Latin. I love to read the Bible in the original and in its various translations. It is a wonderful, a blessed book. I have read some of the sacred books of the Hindoos, and the Koran: I prefer the Gospels to them. I have read some of the ancient philosophers; but the writings of the Evangelists contain excellences which these sages appear manifestly to want. The Epistles of Cicero and Pliny are not like those of Paul, James, John, Peter and Jude. I have read most of the Greek and Latin poets whose works have come down to us, but in my estimation the Hebrew poets infinitely surpass them. I have been reading the Psalms and Proverbs to day; Anacreon and Horace to me would have been a poor substitute for them."—We add one short extract more. The remarks at least are shrewd. "The short chapters are generally read oftenest. There are not a few Christians who select the short chapters to read at family prayers. Had Paul's chapter on charity contained fifty verses, it would not have been sought and read, I fear, half so often as it is. I would inform my readers that the long chapters in holy Writ, as well as the short ones, are worthy of attention."

Carlyle has said, that to be a man, one must have "fire in him to burn up somewhat of the sins of the world, of the miseries and errors of the world: why else is he there?" So thought and wrote Mr. Farr. He knew that he must not live for himself; and if he had failed in one way, he was to toil on in another for the world's welfare; else why was he here? "I do believe," he writes, "in the existence of a holy and just God, in a watchful and righteous providence, and in a state of future retribution. The cause of humanity, benevolence, virtue and piety is that which I espouse. I will defend it, by the aid of Heaven, by my tongue, my pen, my example. My sympathies and influence shall be with virtue. If I can gain access to the minds of

others, the opportunity shall be employed to make their hearts better." And so he worked on, when to our apprehension he had nothing to do, harder than most of us. He was the sole instructer of his older children. He heard their lessons — so covetous was he of his time — while he attended to the duties of the toilet; and so faithful was he in this, that they became adepts in languages at quite an early age. He wrote incessantly, and all the great moral movements of the day he aided by his tongue, his pen, or his example. He gathered about him a class of youth in the Sunday school, he spoke in temperance meetings, he wrote with all his heart against the abominations of slavery. There was not a subject which interested the public, that did not pass through his mind and in some way employ his hand. And considerable as was the amount which he published, he projected still more. His mind was constantly at work, and the plans of unfinished productions which he left — now a volume of essays, now his thoughts on various subjects, and now a touching tale — are almost without number. "My time for musing and meditation," he says, "is the night, after I have laid my head upon my pillow. Going to bed and falling to sleep are not simultaneous acts with me. Many a monk has fewer vigils than I. From my childhood, it has been difficult for me to go to sleep. In the early part of my life, spectres, ghosts, dreams, death-watches, and nightmare, kept me wakeful, till nature triumphed over superstition. When I came to manhood, I had got rid of these bed-fellows, but others stole into their place. Studies, weariness, cares, pains, ruminations on the past, anxiety about the future, kept me sleepless. It is so even now. I fear not apparitions, I seldom dream; but Morpheus comes always with tardy steps to close my eyes. How often have I wished that one of Julius Cæsar's amanuenses could sit by my bed, to give my night musings a visible and durable form! My night thoughts, like my dreams, are so dissipated by the returning light, that it is impossible to record them. There are some things which my memory holds with a giant grasp, but most things pass through my mind with such railroad speed that they leave me weaker, but not wiser."

With this extract we close. Mr Farr was arrested in the midst of his busy thoughts and ripening plans. The

curtains of a longer night gathered around — a dreamless sleep fell upon him. He passed away to that world whose dawning light will not dissipate, but give surpassing distinctness to every good thought and right purpose — where

> The tide of intellect flows clear,
> Strong, full, unchanging, and refined.

He died in Harvard, of a rapid consumption, June 14, 1845, aged 53. He died, having worked faithfully and well, and done somewhat to "burn up the sins, the errors and miseries of the world." We do not claim for him power or brilliancy of talents, or affirm that his works will long survive him. But we do claim that he felt deeply and spoke honestly what was in him; and when we add that he spoke to the wants of a class of his fellow-men and touched a chord in their hearts, we give no small praise. It was all he claimed to desire for himself. A. H.

Art. VIII. — MRS. DANA'S LETTERS.*

Although numerous female Unitarians have adorned some of the fairest and most instructive walks of literature, yet we remember but few, who have ventured to grapple with the sturdy weapons of polemical theology and biblical criticism. Hannah Adams, in her "Letters on the Gospels," throws abundance of critical light on the pages of the New Testament, but contributes little to the stores of strictly Unitarian interpretation, except by those methods of indirectness and implication, which inevitably lead to such a result, whenever an enlightened criticism of any kind is applied to the Bible. Harriet Martineau, in her theological prize Essays, establishes the leading truths of Unitarian Christianity upon impregnable grounds, but relies for the purpose principally on general considerations and popular argument, instead of an array or an examination of Scriptural texts. Joanna Baillie, in an admirable little

* *Letters addressed to Relatives and Friends, chiefly in reply to Arguments in support of the Doctrine of the Trinity.* By Mary S. B. Dana, Author of 'The Southern and Northern Harps,' 'The Parted Family,' etc. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 318.

treatise published a few years since, sets the question between the Trinitarians and Arians, as appears to us, at a final rest. To these names, eminent as they are, is now without hesitation to be added that of Mary S. B. Dana, whose deeply affecting history, and very remarkable book under review, must stamp a memorable epoch in the progress of a cause, which seems destined, like some tree of God, to make growth against the pressure and opposition of every element.

Unitarian Christianity has achieved much for woman. It has come to fortify her, precisely in those departments of her constitution, which expose her to her greatest dangers; while at the same time it possesses resources which amply respond to the religious tenderness and generosity of her nature. Under other systems, the voice of usurped authority has found in woman a too unquestioning and unresisting subject; she has yielded submissively to arrogant pretension; she has trembled slavishly before unwarranted denunciation; she has surrendered her imagination and her affections to theatrical, fantastic, imposing forms, or extreme principles, of religion; she has prostrated her faculties in helpless despair before perplexing doctrines, which forbade and condemned the very use of her reason; she has listened to too predominant exhibitions of the terrific, until distraction and suicide have hastened to close the scene. In these circumstances, the female nature has almost cried aloud instinctively for aid, and has found it more than anywhere else in the genius of Unitarian Christianity. There is a modesty and fairness in the very manner by which Unitarianism asserts its authority over the mind, which not only appeals to woman's delicate sympathy, but at once raises her from the dust, and awakens her to the fact of her own significance. It bids her to be calm — to reflect — to receive a revelation through the medium of her reason, as well as of her imagination and affections.

Yet whilst this system presents just enough of poise and negation to restore woman to her lost equilibrium, it retains, as we have hinted, sufficient positiveness and warmth to satisfy the demands of her earnestly religious constitution. It gives her, in the Eternal Father of spirits, an object of profound adoration, combining in himself

whatever glorious, awful, and endearing attributes or agencies can possibly be ascribed to the Trinity of the middle ages; while, by demonstrating the singleness and simplicity of his being, it quiets her harrowed faculties, fixes her distracted vision, and raises her faith from a state of helpless and abject prostration to a serene, enlightened, and confiding repose. In the innocent babe upon her knee, she no longer beholds a mass of total depravity, a viperous enemy of God, a vessel of eternal wrath and torment — but a hopeful subject of the kingdom of heaven, whose immortal powers are in part to be unfolded by her own prayerful vigilance and faithful exertions. In the Scriptural view of the Atonement which she is now called upon to adopt, she is not bewildered by the dramatic representation of one Divine being possessing all the justice, and another all the mercy; nor is she baffled by the contradictions which incessantly spring up between the alleged necessity that a Divine being should be sacrificed, and the allowed impossibility that he could die, coupled with the freshly puzzling fact that after all only a human being endured the sacrifice required. She rather sees in the Atonement a great scheme of reconciliation — a series of healing and restoring influences, contemplated from eternity by a God whose justice and mercy well knew how to temper and co-exist with each other, and at length introduced by the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world — a scheme, thus truly worthy to be illustrated, and even prefigured, by the types and shadows of the Mosaic dispensation. In her prospect of the retributions of futurity, her imagination is no longer either pampered or revolted by presentments too over-powering for human nature; but it is wholesomely stimulated by that solemn indistinctness, yet awakening certainty of result, — the heaven of happiness and progress all above her, the hell of darkness and misery all below her, — which are everywhere characteristic of the moral government of God. In Jesus Christ, as presented by the same system, the chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely, the chosen of the Father from the bosom of a past eternity, she recognises the link which unites the human and Divine — the realized ideal of her most exalted imaginings — the perfect archetype of her purely aspiring affections. While the perplex-

ing metaphysics of a falsely styled orthodoxy had taken away her Lord, and buried his identity in a mass of contradiction and mystery, Unitarian Christianity has restored him to her in his original proportions; it has rescued from artificial clouds and darkness the great subject of the New Testament biography; she can now venture to approach him again as a being whose heart beats in unison with her own — to bathe his feet with her tears, and to wipe them with the hair of her head.

Accordingly, woman in return has effected much for Unitarian Christianity. In the critical transition-period, when a change was in progress from a complicated and humanly devised to a purer and simpler faith — when the spirit of reform was necessarily more or less analytical, negative, and defensive — when charges of coldness and unbelief rang from all the camps of Orthodoxy, — woman was found ready, in a full-proportioned representation, to partake of the enlightening process. She perceived, by her characteristic intuition, much that was positive and profoundly religious in the system that was unfolding anew, and she acted upon it by anticipation. The moment that Unitarianism respected, appealed to, and convinced her understanding, she accepted it with all its consequences — discerning and despising the hollowness of the spasmodic outcry raised against it. The Divine authority of Jesus and his religion she at once and honestly felt could be no cold negation, no isolated or empty fact, no dictate of infidelity or deism; but, from the very terms of the question, a principle deep as the wants, lofty as the hopes, and wide as the workings of the human soul. Therefore it has been, that in the darkest and most laborious periods of his career, the Unitarian reformer has been invariably cheered and supported by her countenance and adhesion. Part of his reproach her manifest faith and piety have turned away, and the rest she has cheerfully borne along with him. When, with an anxious heart, he has first spread the table of his Master, and invited the guests to come, she, if few or none else, was near, to partake of the speaking memorials. How often, in the hour of death, has her deliberate testimony and ripe preparation put to silence and shame the solemn but silly proverb, so widely circulated, that Unitarianism is a poor religion to die by! How often, in

the battle of life, has she sustained with a heavenly composure the lowering odium of excited communities! And how often have her quiet smile and pungent remark refuted the extravagant dogmas, or retorted the menacing artillery of bigotry and fanaticism! With her "willing hands" she has toiled to uphold and adorn the ark of her faith, as it rose amidst sad discouragements and difficulties; and even now, wherever that faith, no longer struggling and militant, has become triumphant and commanding, many of its golden fruits, its spontaneous emanations, are started into life, or carried into large effect, by her fostering and benignant enterprise. Religious charities and amenities spring up all around her home; while the missionary, supported by her exertions and bounties, transplants to the distant wilderness the truths and principles which her experience assures her are from above. It is unquestionably the peculiar blessing of every Unitarian minister in the land, that he can gratefully point to the female portion of his congregation, as unsurpassed for intelligence, refinement, virtue, and attachment to religious institutions.

Thus has woman brought many a fragrant flower and heart-prompted sacrifice to load the altar of Unitarian Christianity; — which she will do again and again in all coming years. But it was reserved, we believe, for the fair author under review, as the representative of her sex, to grasp in addition the rugged strength of the altar's very horns! Full, herself, of all feminine sensitiveness, keenly alive to every religious responsibility, child-like and humble, — as indeed she must necessarily be in yielding to the evident conclusions of reason, the most truly humble of our faculties, — weeping at the severance of endeared associations, and wounded and crushed that she was compelled to offend the surprised affections of her friends, she has encountered and mastered the chief posts of the Unitarian controversy — resolved its difficulties — seized the prominent points of its varied learning — wielded its arguments often with a new grace and effect, — and fought her way, through tears and tremblings, yet with a talent and independent vigor usually called masculine, to the free, serene, and joy-inspiring elevation of the rational and liberal Christian.

The peculiar circumstances of Mrs. Dana's case render

her conversion to these principles the more striking, and exhibit a fresh testimony to the truth and power of Unitarianism, as well as a signal encouragement to its advocates. The daughter of a highly respected and influential Orthodox clergyman of South Carolina, who is connected, however, at present with no particular charge, she was nurtured in the very arms of Calvinism, and rocked into growth upon its exclusive lap. Her entire education and associations have combined with the circumstance of her birth, to represent her early religion as the only true form of Christianity, and Unitarianism as one of its most deadly disfigurements and corruptions. For several years past, indeed, her heart and sense have rebelled against some of the most glaring moral extravagances of the (so called) orthodox creed. Yet, like thousands of others, she fondly flattered herself that there must be some secret elastic spring, some blessed chemistry of the mind, to reconcile the iron impositions of the church with the irresistible dictates of reason and conscience and nature. A number of successful publications, founded on the doctrinal basis of a mild Calvinism, or a spiritual Arminianism, have within a few years proceeded from her pen, and found favor in a wide circle throughout the United States. Thus every selfish and every social motive — pride of family, pride of consistency, natural affection, covenant-obligation, friendship, interest, reputation, repose, the consciousness, so sweet to self-love and pride and indolence, that the majority is on one's side — all seemed to unite in resisting the great change to which her stronger honesty and love of truth at length constrained her. It is now scarcely a year since her actively inquiring mind, stimulated by a sacred and generous curiosity, determined to know for itself the precise character of Unitarian Christianity, and the weakness or strength of the arguments which connect it with the teachings of Scripture. The lives of its votaries told her one thing; her hereditary prejudices and surrounding connections told her another. With the Bible in her hand as the chief guide in her new line of investigation, aided by some treatises procured from Unitarians, the first perusal of the Gospel of St. John sealed her better fate. A chaos of clouds, doubts, difficulties, and sorrows, that had been brooding darkly over her spirit since her entrance on the years of discretion, began to be lifted

up and to disperse away. Her book itself must eloquently relate the remainder of her agitating experiences.

The occasion of its composition and publication requires a few remarks. As soon as her views assumed a substantive form, she entered upon a correspondence with her beloved and venerated parents, — and this commences the work. The letters between herself and her father constitute a new chapter in ecclesiastical, and even in literary history. The mutual position of the parties, together with the nature and manner of the correspondence, produces in the reader at times something like an intensely dramatic interest. It is one of those cases, (in fact the whole book is one,) in which truth is more exciting than fiction. The father and the daughter appear nobly worthy of each other. Although extracts only are given from his letters, yet we judge from them that he must have acted a kind, delicate, and dignified part throughout. Evidently chagrined and grieved at the cause of the correspondence, and manifesting considerable prejudice against Unitarianism, he yet mingles with his arguments, which by the way he conducts with talent and acuteness, no contumelious reproaches, nor frown of overbearing authority. In the mean time, the event having soon taken air, other letters, of a far different character, poured in upon her from various quarters. The arguments and considerations urged in them were so frequently repeated by different correspondents, the letters themselves were so numerous, reports of so wild a character were spread abroad, and her case was made, in some lectures she was invited to attend, so special and personal a theme of pulpit discussion, that it became out of the question for her to answer everything in detail. For a while, the hunted deer stood at bay. At the risk of seeming obstinacy and discourteousness, a forbearing silence was preserved towards most of her correspondents and friends. At length, overruling the objections of her father to an early exhibition of her views, she felt compelled, out of respect for herself and her opponents, to take some public notice of their appeals. The felicitous idea was entertained of answering them all together in a single publication. The author's prominent position in her social sphere, the additional prominence forced upon her by her new circumstances, together with her having already been accustomed to the public eye,

rendered this the most natural and appropriate course to be pursued.

Neither the names nor the letters of her correspondents appear in the work, but only such extracts as touch the pith of the controversy, and seem to require an emphatic reply — so that no parties can complain of a personal exposure. It might be unfair to criticise these extracts, and to rebuke much in them which appears to us exceptionable. The author herself indeed has performed the task in a spirit at once lovely and lofty, with now and then a touch of that quiet humor, which, in perfect accordance with the workings of nature, often springs up from an injured and aching heart. But one remark we cannot forbear. It seems never to have occurred to these letter-writers, the professed friends of Mrs. Dana, that her own motives and situation, erroneous as might have been the results of her inquiries, were worthy of all tender sympathy and generous admiration. While these friends constantly aim to move her from her course by exciting her pity for her family, why should they not recollect that there are two parties to that question? Why no indication of compassion for the noble woman, whose honest love of truth impelled her through mental struggles and sacrifices, such as few of her sex are ever called to endure? May Heaven preserve Christians of every name from that narrowness and blindness, which would seem to exclude the ordinary flowings of human sympathy!

We hope and believe that the book, when perused by Mrs. Dana's correspondents and acquaintances, will infuse a happier feeling, and impart light and satisfaction on many points, respecting which they are now groping in misconception, disappointment, and uncharitableness. We take the liberty also to recommend it to the whole religious, and more especially the Unitarian public. Our preceding remarks will have sufficiently evinced that it must be far other than a volume of mere criticism and controversy. It presents, generally speaking, besides the deep personal interest everywhere awakened, a series of spirited essays on the most important subjects that can attract the religious inquirer. The tone and style rise as we advance from letter to letter. The writer appears to become more impressed with the grandeur and security of her position, and more familiar with its resources of defence. We have been

inclined to marvel how a lady, whose education and life had been steeped in the popular theology, should, in the course of a single winter, so thoroughly imbibe the habitual breath of Unitarian Christianity — argue in the tone of its veteran advocates—seem ready with its abstrusest criticisms and indoctrinated in its broadest views — and shake off, with so much ease, the force of the few proof-texts that have been stereotyped as impregnable on the opposite side. Months appear in this case to have performed the usual work of years. But the phenomenon perhaps may be explained by recollecting her habits of literary labor and research; her evident powers of generalizing;* her mental flexibility, as evinced by various poetical, prose, and musical publications; the change that her contemplative mind had already wrought for itself from Calvinism to Arminianism; the ardency of temperament which glows out from many parts of her book; the more than common talents which her correspondents allow her to possess; and the double hours of toil, which, from some expressions in the Letters, she seems, in this great business of her soul, to have eagerly undertaken. However this may be, she will be found worthy to take honorable rank with the Worcesters, the Eddys, the Jacob Nortons, the Wilsons, the Folsoms, the Pitkins, the Forsters, and others of her countrymen, who, during the last thirty years, have straitly preceded her in her change of faith, and published the processes and results of their inquiries to the world. Let her speculations be set by the side of that mystical, inconsequent production — the "Morning Watches" — of the otherwise highly gifted Fredrika Bremer, and the comparison, with every unprejudiced mind, will be immensely in favor of the American woman.

Those portions of the book which are peculiarly and necessarily controversial, may possibly be more required in the vicinity of the author's residence, than in that of the place of its publication. Yet even in the latter neighborhood we bespeak for the entire work a generous interest

* A happy instance of this faculty is presented in Letter XIX, where she demonstrates to an anxious friend, that her change of speculative faith has by no means impaired the main principles, which she had advanced with prominence in the most popular of her publications, and on which she had relied for comfort and support in her former trials and sorrows.

and patronage. There have existed in certain quarters for many years rather a morbid dread and distaste for biblical controversy. The exclamation was too frequent, — why continue the agitation of questions, which have been settled again and again? But it should be remembered, that a great majority of the Christian world are still in an antagonist position to Unitarians; the questions have *not* yet been settled for *them*; they still blindly persist in advancing the texts and arguments that have been so often explained and refuted. Nor has discussion yet proceeded so far among even enlightened scholars on both sides of the great question, as to leave no room for future concessions, or enable them to decide on what points they must never expect to agree. Until this desirable end is attained, we must consent to be taxed with controversy and all its inconveniences. We must hope that the spirit of it will grow milder and milder, that men will study the Scriptures together as they study botany, in mutual harmony — that the *odium theologicum* will recede into increasing distance, and that the ground of contest will grow narrower and narrower. New Stuarts will arise to annihilate with a sarcasm the argument founded on "Let us make man in our image," and new Emersons to declare that he must be a fool or a knave, who should allege, in defence of the Trinity, the words "I and my Father are one." In favor of these discussions it may also be urged, that the youthful portion of our denomination, who have entered upon life since their fathers settled the great difficulties for themselves, need being enlightened on the principles of criticism and modes of reasoning which have severed them from the rest of Christendom, and placed them, as we believe, in advance of it.

We have therefore been gratified in perceiving that within a few years past something of a healthy reaction in this respect has taken place, and that several new works of a very instructive character on the Unitarian controversy have been favorably received. It is a symptom of life, though not, it may be, the highest life. We predict a similar favor for the present publication, combining the same sort of instruction as the others, with the attractive interest of personal biography, at times equalling that of romance, It seems, for instance, to draw truth down from

the domain of the abstract and argumentative into that of home-felt reality, when we not only witness the process of conviction going on in the mind of the reasoner, but see her at the same time experiencing the first impulses of awakening doubt while she attends her bible-class; or, amidst her wondering companions in the singing-seats of her native church, declining to join in the doxology; or rising at four in the morning to answer the letters of her revered father; or approaching the solemn determination, that she will without delay begin to attend on Unitarian preaching; or harrassed with epistles from every part of the country, which only put her opinions to new tests, and give occasion to her faith and intellect and charity for higher triumphs. Her book is not only a defence of Unitarian Christianity, but it is Unitarian Christianity itself in beautiful life and action. Pressed with many sorts of provocations, the writer never loses her balance, but mingles a high spirit and a meek temper together, to a degree that is seldom seen. With confidence we commend her Letters to those Trinitarians, in whom an exclusive frame of mind has not entirely extinguished a liberal curiosity and a love of independent inquiry. Whether they relinquish or continue in their present faith, they will here learn the right mode of doing either.

Few, if any, special animadversions occur to us, as we scrutinize the work with the eyes of impartial criticism. No doubt it might have been improved by some compression, and some slight modification of arrangement; but then it would have lost the charm and life of letters thrown off at a heat, besides being incompatible with the urgent circumstances of its publication. If, on some future occasion, when her mighty doctrinal battles shall all have been fought, and served their full purposes, the author shall feel inclined to gratify the opponents of controversy above described, and publish an abridged edition without the more purely critical and polemical parts, she might present them with one of the most popular and interesting books of the day. But whether such a process could be found practicable, and whether the viand would not lose much of its flavor by such an extraction of the bones, we are disposed to doubt.

Perhaps the author has laid a more exclusive stress than

we should have done on that point of interpretation, which applies the word *God* to Jesus in an inferior sense. Such an interpretation, we allow, is in harmony with certain Scriptural and Oriental usages, and is even fortified by our Saviour's own authority in a particular case.* It may be fairly adopted at any time as one alternative to the revolting perplexities of Trinitarianism. Persons, who are just fresh from the meshes of that system, where they have been tormented into conscious Tritheism by the ascription of supreme divinity to three separate agents, are apt to find relief in a method of explication which authorises a lower sense for the term in question. But we apprehend that in most of those passages where Divine titles, attributes, and agencies are ascribed to Jesus, the more natural and obvious method, as well as more conformable to the general usages of Scripture and the genius of the Hebrew piety, is, to accept them in their very highest signification. If Moses saw his Creator in the burning bush; if the patriarchs adored him in two, and sometimes three angel-travellers; if the prophets, by a sublime impersonation, often represented *themselves* as the Deity;† and if the whole Israelitish nation acknowledged him in the Shekinah of the tabernacle, — well might the Apostles, Evangelists, and other early disciples have similarly recognised him in the person of his own perfect and anointed Messiah. In this forcible Orientalism, which, by a quick imagination, identified the medium of manifestation with the being who was manifested, they did but express the hereditary, traditional tendency of their nation. The same mental habitude was illustrated by their kindred of Samaria, who exclaimed as they followed Simon, "This man is the great power of God." Stronger still to the same purport is the language of the inhabitants of Nain, (Luke vii. 16,) "That a great prophet is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people." Here, by a plain Hebrew parallelism, the fact in the first clause of the quotation is identified with the fact in the last. Well and easily, therefore, may the enlightened Unitarian, the thoughtful, inductive student of the Scriptures, who

* John x. 35.

† Isaiah x. 6. Hosea, chaps. vii. and xiv. Also, particularly, Deut. chap. xi. and xxix. 1 — 6, where Moses interchanges his own person and that of the Deity in a manner as remarkable as ever Jesus employed for himself, or his Apostles for him.

has long habitually felt the immediate impress of divinity on every part of the religion of Jesus, adopt an analogous acceptation of the passages under consideration. Everywhere and forever, with St. Paul, he sees and worships "God in Christ" — the Divine power, in its depository, its moral depository, too, of humanity! Readily, with St. Thomas, in this Scriptural sense, does he acknowledge in his Master, who walks from the grave in the sole might of Jehovah, his Lord and his God! This principle of interpretation we prefer to the other, inasmuch as it rises from the specialities of mere Socinianism to a loftier and more comprehensive Unitarianism, and meets the exigencies of a much wider range of Scriptural representation. Maintaining the strict unity of the Godhead, it more simply reconciles, as we think, the lowliest language descriptive of the person and condition of the Saviour with his highest offices and titles.

An extract or two from different parts of the book shall now be given, as characteristic specimens, and as incitements for our readers to a complete perusal. The first shall contain parts of the opening letter. Could so difficult a task be accomplished with more delicacy of tact, respectfulness and tenderness of filial bearing, or commanding sense of personal responsibility?

"January 19th, 1845.

MY KIND AND VENERATED PARENTS:

It has become my solemn duty to make to you an announcement, which, I fear, will fill your hearts with sorrow. Would to God, that I could save you from the pain, which, from my knowledge of your views and feelings, I am sure awaits you; but I believe, as God is my Judge, that *truth* is dearer to me than life itself, and I dare no longer disavow the sentiments, which, after thorough, and *honest*, and prayerful deliberation, I have at length adopted.

I will keep you no longer in suspense, but will proceed to declare, that I do not now believe that my blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Supreme God. I believe that there is but *one* God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. I believe that 'all power,' was *given* unto him in Heaven and on earth; that he was the Messiah predicted by the Old Testament writers, who, in the fulness of time, came into the world with a commission from God, and full power and authority to do the work which

God had given him to do. In other words, after long and earnest deliberation, much diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, and fervent prayer to God for the assistance of his spirit, I conscientiously and firmly reject the doctrine of the Trinity.

This doctrine was a part of my education. I received it, as many others do, without thorough investigation, though, I must confess, it has often perplexed me beyond measure. Still I held it, as it seems to me all must do, as a strange mystery, which I must not attempt to comprehend; not considering, that a mystery does not necessarily suppose an incomprehensibility; and losing sight of the danger of admitting, what now appears to me to be an impossibility. It is impossible for me, and I now perceive that it has always been impossible to make one of three, or three of one, — one perfect and infinite being equal to three perfect and infinite beings. There may be gifted minds capable of comprehending this doctrine, but such is not mine. It is plain to me now, that I have all my life been worshipping three distinct beings; never having been able, with the most strenuous efforts, to combine the three in my own mind so as to form a simple idea. But now I bow to the divine authority, when I hear Jehovah saying, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is *one* Lord.'

But to return. So anxious have I always been for clearer views upon this point, that I have eagerly read everything upon the Trinitarian side of the question which came in my way; yet always without the satisfaction so desirable to an honest and inquisitive mind, and always with the same melancholy feeling, that it was *a strange mystery*; though still I felt *bound* to receive it." — pp. 1 — 3.

"When the subject first presented itself fully and distinctly before my mind, in connection with a desire and a determination to give it a complete investigation, I felt an instinctive fear, almost a *horror*, at my presumption. I took Dr. Dwight's sermons upon the divinity of Christ, and tried to be convinced that I had all my life been in the right — I read them over and over again — I had anxious days and sleepless nights; and even in my dreams my visions were of three distinct Gods, entangled together in dreadful and inextricable confusion. Thus was I driven to the examination of the subject with a power which I could not withstand.

My chief source of information has been the New Testament, and especially the gospel by John. I endeavored to read with an unprejudiced mind, and a teachable spirit, and to explain passages of *doubtful import* by those which could admit of *no possible mistake.* While thus reading, the doctrines of the absolute unity of God, and of the *derived* power and authority of his Son, shone forth from every page of the blessed volume with a

brightness and a clearness perfectly convincing to my wondering mind. I could no longer resist the mass of evidence which seemed fully to establish the superiority of the Father to the Son. I found that Christ always spoke of himself as inferior to his Father, of his power and authority as derived from his Father, — and it seemed to me that, if the case were otherwise, (with humility let me say it,) our blessed Lord had studiously endeavored to mislead us." — pp. 5, 6.

"And now, when I sit down seriously to compare the system of doctrines with which I have so long been fettered, with those under the influence of which my freed spirit now joyfully springs to meet its benevolent Creator, I cannot but exclaim, 'thanks be to God, who hath given me the victory, through my Lord Jesus Christ!' My *mind* is disenthralled, disenchanted, awakened as from a death-like stupor, — all mists are cleared away, — and this feeling of light, and life, and liberty, arises from a delightful consciousness that I have learned to give the Scriptures a rational and simple interpretation, and that, on the most important of all subjects, I have learned to think for myself.

My views of my Lord and Master are dearer to me than ever before, because they are more definite. He is still my Saviour, and the Saviour of the world — the instrument chosen by his Father through whom to bestow his unmerited mercy; a willing instrument, for he delighted to do his Father's will; an all-sufficient instrument, for *all power* was given unto him. I believe that a living faith, which will lead us to imitate him, is the only ground of our salvation; but, while I fully believe in the divinity of his character and of his mission, I do not believe that he was the supreme God himself. I believe in the efficacy of his death, — the most striking circumstance of his history, — for it was *the seal of a new and better covenant*, — an evidence of his divine commission, and of his devotion to his Father's will; without which he would not have given us such an assurance of the glorious certainty of a resurrection, by being himself the first-born from the dead; without which his work would have been incomplete, and much less calculated to affect our hearts, to bring us to repentance, to lead us to God, and to save our souls.

You cannot suppose, my beloved Parents, that I have embraced these opinions hastily or carelessly. It is painful to expose oneself to the charge of fickleness, and it is very painful to separate oneself from those who are near and dear; but God is to be my Judge; to Him alone I must answer for my opinions; to my own Master I must stand or fall; and I dare not disavow what, upon mature deliberation, I believe to be the truth. I love you, God knows how well! but I love the *truth* better; and your blessed Saviour and mine has said, 'He that loveth

father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.' If then I embrace in my heart the doctrine which appears to me to be taught by Christ himself, must I not avow it?" — pp. 8, 9.

To a correspondent, whose arguments in behalf of Calvinism she has encountered with a masterly logic, she concludes in this elevated and impassioned strain: —

"After all that I have said, my dear Sir, after plainly stating to you how Calvinism appears to me now, you will not wonder that I dread and fear it. I regard it almost as I would some venomous serpent, from whose fangs I have but narrowly escaped. Too long has it been coiling itself around my struggling spirit. That its poisonous fangs have not reached my vitals, I owe to that wonderful Providence of God which has protected me from harm, and, at length, provided a way of escape. He has given me strength to struggle on, till, at length, I have thrown the monster from me. I bless God for my escape.

You will perhaps think that this is unreasonably strong language; but if you only knew how I have suffered — how my whole life has been clouded over by this gloomy faith — how, even in moments when I have been joyfully welcoming the pure beams of the Sun of Righteousness, its dark cloud has frightened me from afar, its low, muttered tones of thunder have reached my ears, like a sound foreboding evil — you would not think my language too impassioned. Be it so or not, it is just as I feel.

My religion is my all. Without it, what should I be, or what should I do? Without it, how, in my early years, could I have borne the changes and sorrows which have fallen to my lot? I love my religion dearly, for it has been emphatically *my friend.* Then, if I have been able conscientiously to give up all that was dark and debasing about it, while I keep all that is bright and elevating, how can I be too thankful? How can I speak too strongly? I sometimes wonder why, before I had proved the all-sustaining power of religion in my own experience, I did not give way to skepticism, and become the victim of infidelity. I cannot but remember the shocking doubts which sometimes found their way into my mind; doubts which sometimes made me miserable for weeks together. Rebellious and unworthy thoughts of God, my heavenly Father and Friend; how they used to haunt and torture me! They grew out of my creed. To a person of my 'mental constitution,' if I thought about it at all, it could not be otherwise. I could not teach myself to reconcile contradictions. I could not school myself to receive, what always seemed to me absurdities. I never examined them deeply. I *tried* to believe them, but tried without success; or,

at most, it was a strange sort of belief, against my better judgment.

It was an extorted faith. I feared to believe otherwise. And soon the time came, when, under the pressure of deep affliction, religion became absolutely necessary to me. I clung therefore to the practical and truthful, shutting my eyes upon all the rest. I have, indeed, endeavored to indoctrinate myself — to *understand* what I thought I *must* believe, and to fill my mind with arguments for that belief; but I never before now *thoroughly* examined the question, whether those opinions were true. I never *myself*, and I confess it with sorrow, brought them meekly to the law and to the testimony, to judge, by my own reason, *whether they could be found there.* I was *afraid to doubt.* And in regard to *the Trinity*, I did not doubt till lately." — pp. 131, 132.

"For my part, I thank God that *I am free.* I breathe the air of religious liberty, and it revives my soul. I raise my unshackled hands in gratitude to Heaven, and sing aloud for joy. But still I remember the struggle — the conflict between light and darkness — the despairing avowal of a belief which was revolting to my very soul; it was wormwood and gall; my soul hath it in remembrance.

My eyes are now opened to behold the truth, and beauty, and symmetry, of another faith than yours, and not all your declarations and bold assertions can turn what I behold, into what *you assert it to be.* Show me another scheme of faith, and let me compare it with the Bible, but do not attempt to frighten me by hard names and dark pictures of your own creation. It is easy to dress up a hideous figure, and call it Unitarianism, but those who are choosing for eternity will not be very readily deceived by any such imaginary creation." — p. 134.

Among the letters which recur most prominently to our memory, are the fourth, containing an acute discussion with her father on the "connexion of doctrines;" the eighteenth, in which the writer detects and refutes the ingenious sophism of some religious friend, who wishes to withdraw her from the pursuit of what he considers abstract truth! the twenty-sixth, in which the author lucidly details the "method of investigation" by which she arrived at her present views — a model, as it seems to us, for all impartial students of the Scripture; and the thirtieth, or last, breathing forth the mingled tones of sorrow and joy from the depths of her own uncommon experience. But different letters, probably, will variously strike different minds.

The following list of the titles of a portion of her letters, together with the recollection that under each title a number of collateral subjects are frequently started and exhausted, will convey some idea of the wide range of critical, moral, and theological disquisition pursued: — opening letter to her parents, giving a history of her "change of views;" the "terms, God and Lord;" "Scott's Notes, Whitby's retractation," etc.; "connexion of doctrines;" "investigation no crime;" "honesty — Dr. Watts;" "Unitarians do not deny Christ;" "views of atonement;" "mental freedom;" "Calvinism;" "God our Father;" "signs of the times;" "truth and its consequences;" "election;" "the phrase 'I am';" "mental suffering;" "use of reason;" "no human creeds;" "causes of infidelity;" "painful themes." An Appendix of more than forty pages illustrates the whole by several apposite quotations.

It is to be hoped that the present volume is only an *avant-courier* for many a future one, and that Mrs. Dana's ready pen will follow new trains of speculation for the benefit of her adopted denomination, as well as the religious world at large.

We congratulate our Spartan ranks on this unsought and unexpected acquisition. Votaries as we are of that calm and steadfast proselytism, which consists in an open and unflinching profession and defence of our faith, an humble endeavor to live according to its teachings, and a patient waiting for God's own spirit and providence to soften our opponents and multiply our associates, we shall not pretend to conceal the pleasure with which we have penned the foregoing pages, and recorded the event which they commemorate. At the same time, with the disappointments, exaggerated and shortlived though they will unquestionably prove to be, which this event may have occasioned among surrounding friends and connections, we profess respectfully to sympathise. We rejoice to know, that such has been the universal sentiment in the Unitarian congregation more immediately interested in Mrs. Dana's change of faith. And on the other hand, we equally rejoice to acknowledge, that the church which she has necessarily left, has neither outraged her feelings, nor dishonored its own records, nor offended the charitable,

Christian sense of the age, by any act of ecclesiastical persecution, or even censure. Would that all conscientious changes of opinion might be accompanied by similar exhibitions of charity and delicacy. Never, at least, may our own good cause acquire or dismiss its adherents, by trampling rough-shod over the sacred and tender feelings of humanity, although we are well aware that a policy so mild often tells scantily for the mere statistics of sect-building. We have all confidence in the eternal strength and unbounded growth of our principles; but whether they are to extend, as in the present instance, under circumstances of individual anguish and rapid development, or are to advance, as they have so often done, by a quiet and imperceptible expansion, until whole churches, and communities, and nations find themselves blown back by the silent breath of the Spirit to the shore of simple, primitive Christianity, may our only note of triumph ever be that, which we now tender to our neophyte friend — Welcome to a band of believers, whose prayers shall be raised for you, whose sympathies shall be with you, and who, while they wish and promise you all joy and peace in believing, will never interfere with the eagle-freedom of your thought! S. G.

Art. IX. — SUMNER'S ORATION.*

The celebration of the Fourth of July was at first very naturally marked by the exultation of success. The founding of a national independent existence is an august work; the resistance to tyranny has been considered, in every age, a sacred duty. Life, fortune, and honor have been pledged to the achievement by the most gallant spirits who have illustrated the history of man. The American Revolution stands prominently forward among the great warlike and political events, which have been brought to pass by suffering, self-sacrifice and toil, and which have rewarded the actors in them with imperishable glory. The poet's lyre,

* *The True Grandeur of Nations; an Oration delivered before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July* 4, 1845. By Charles Sumner. Boston: J. H. Eastburn. 1845. 8vo. pp. 104.

the historian's pen, the painter's canvas, and the sculptor's chisel have united to eternize the men who have acted, and the deeds which have been done. We cannot reasonably be surprised then, that those who have been called upon to speak on our national anniversary, have usually indulged in the language of exultation and of patriotic pride. The limits of good taste have rarely been scrupulously observed, and sounding rant has frequently supplied the place of chastened eloquence. American oratory does not stand alone, however, in this species of glory. The ancient "demonstrative eloquence," so called, was as profuse in patriotic exaggeration, as copious in high-sounding words, as all-comprehensive in the claims of national egotism, as the most vaunting orations of the Fourth of July; but the remains of it which have come down to us, embalmed in the spiced languages of Greece and Rome, are treated with a reverence which rarely ventures to criticise their unsubstantial character. And then, what an immense mass of the eloquence of independent Athens passed into that limbo of literature, into which our own "eloquent" annual productions hurry with frightful rapidity. Let us then, while we smile at the frothiness of most of our festive eloquence, do it the justice to remember, that the patriotic orations of the most polished nation of antiquity frothed and foamed as much as we, and for every hyperbolical extravagance which has ever been uttered in compliment to ourselves on the Fourth of July, we might have had the highest possible authority, if time had been so good as to spare them. In the Menexenus of Plato, from which Mr. Sumner quotes and adapts a passage, Socrates hits off the *obligato* demonstrative eloquence of his countrymen very well.

"O Menexenus," says the sly sage, "it goes hard but that to die in battle is a very fine thing, in many points of view: for he who does so receives a beautiful and magnificent burial, even if he die poor; and then he gets eulogized, however worthless, by able men who do not praise at random, but who have prepared their discourses a long time beforehand; who so beautifully eulogize, that by saying of each person what is applicable to him and what is not, and embellishing with phrases in the finest possible style, they cheat our very souls. They pass all manner of encomiums upon the city, and praise those who have perished in war, and our ancestors of all past times, and ourselves who are still alive, so that I, for one, O Menexenus, feel nobly, being

praised by them, and always stand, listening and delighted, thinking that I have forthwith grown larger and nobler and handsomer. And as is generally the case, there are strangers accompanying me, and listening at the same time, and I immediately become a more important personage in their eyes. For they also seem to me to be similarly affected both towards me and towards the rest of the city — to think it more admirable than it was before, being persuaded by the speaker. And this importance remains with me more than three days. So like flute-music the words and voice of the orator steal into my ears, that for four or five days I scarcely remember myself or perceive where on earth I am, but in the mean time I all but imagine I am dwelling in the islands of the Blest. So able are our orators."

Thus much for the Fourth of July eloquence of the Athenians. Our own great national anniversary has, of late years, been turned to somewhat different purposes. We have heard fewer common-places about the heroes "who fought, bled, and died," on Bunker Hill — our modern Marathon, or at Lexington — our American pass of Thermopylæ. Earnest men have ventured to seize the occasion for uttering words of warning, and teaching the people their duties. For it cannot be denied, that the course of public events for the last twelve or fifteen years has created alarm of a serious nature, and to a great extent, in the minds of our most thoughtful citizens. The frightful extent of public dishonesty among those who have been selected by our national government for offices of trust and responsibility; the grasping profligacy of place-hunters; the infamous facility with which large bodies of citizens are willing to give the lie to their own convictions repeatedly and solemnly expressed, when the supposed interests of a party or the bidding of a favorite demagogue moves them; the lowering of the qualities of character, the abilities, and the experience demanded in candidates for the highest public offices, and the gradual but very perceptible vulgarizing of the administration of our general government, consequent on the scanty qualifications, vulgar manners, and contemptible abilities of those who are too often entrusted with it: — all these are omens of evil, which may well cause the true patriot to look forward with anxiety to the future. The brutal ignorance of large masses of persons of foreign birth, who are placed by a too facile policy in the full possession

of the rights of citizenship, and the equally brutal ignorance of large bodies of citizens of native origin, in some portions of our country, are subjects of grave reflection with all who take the trouble to reason on the causes of national downfall.

But of all the influences from which our country has the most to fear, the most dangerous is the passion for territorial aggrandizement even at the peril of war. The whole past history of the world is but one continued and terrible lesson upon this appalling subject. And yet men will not learn wisdom from the sufferings of others: the present age is ready to plunge into the same folly and the same wickedness that have desolated so much of the past. And in full view of the present condition of Europe, whose population is sunk in hopeless poverty by the vast accumulations of debt which have grown up in ages of warfare, our republic stands ready, on every trifling emergency, and even to avenge imaginary wrongs, to plunge madly into all the guilt and misery of war. Under these circumstances, when a bad national ambition is rampant in the land, what more suitable subject could an orator appointed by the municipal authorities of the city of Boston have selected, than the "True Grandeur of Nations?" We are rushing forward, with fatal speed, in the career of false grandeur, which has led other nations to their downfall; what more fitting moment to urge upon the attention of the public those principles of righteousness which are the only true foundation of national as well as of individual prosperity: — the principles of justice and peace, — the truths of the Christian religion?

Mr. Sumner is entitled to the thanks of all true lovers of their country for the manly stand he took on the Fourth of July. The subject he selected was the most pressing of all possible themes at that moment. The occasion was a great civic celebration of the birth-day of our national independence, and was therefore a most suitable one for the discussion of topics which concern most deeply our national morals and our continued well-being. The oration was listened to by an unusually large audience with marked attention. The moral sense of the great body of the hearers assented cordially and applaudingly to the noble morality of the orator; and there were probably few persons who left the hall without having their sense of justice and their

feeling of moral responsibility quickened by the burning words to which they had been listening. A portion of the audience consisted of military men — the usual guests on that occasion. This circumstance led some over-fastidious people to question the propriety of Mr. Sumner's course. And it may fairly be admitted that this circumstance deserved consideration. A moment's reflection however, we think, will prove that there is no indelicacy in discussing the blessings of peace in the presence of military men, in our age. The most vivid delineations of the horrors of war have been drawn by soldiers themselves; and there is not, probably, living in Christendom an educated military man who does not look upon war as the most terrible scourge that ever afflicted humanity, and the resort to it as justifiable only on the ground of dire necessity. Indeed, the men who have the fighting to do and the hard knocks to receive, very naturally have the liveliest perception of the unspeakable horrors of their trade. The military historians of the Peninsular Campaigns have dealt truly and honestly with their subject, but it was left to the civilian Alison to deck with the meretricious ornaments of his false rhetoric the fields of honor, — those shambles where so many thousands of human beings died the death of brutes. This historian, with sonorous phrases of Christian belief ready for use at a moment's warning, writes in a worse than Pagan spirit of the bloody deeds of war. One would suppose in reading his tedious volumes, that the demoniac passions which burn in the soldier's breast at the moment of the shock of battle, were the most virtuous sentiments ever known to the human soul; and that the glory gained by butchering men on a gigantic scale was the only glory worthy of immortal fame. After gloating over bloody details which make the heart sicken, how are we disgusted at the pompous parade of panegyrical phrases with which he consecrates the memory of those fiendish scenes, and of the fiends who enacted them. But the men who saw and shared in these campaigns do not thus trifle with truth and conscience; they do not thus set up a Pagan idol for the worship of Christian people.

In this age and in our country men ought not to shrink from the freest discussion; and of all the days in the year, one would suppose that "Independence day" might, with-

out censure, be devoted to the frank expression of opinions on national subjects. No military man has a right to take offence, because a public speaker uses the liberty of expressing what he deems to be the true character of war. The man of war is not personally assailed; and if war is morally wrong, he most of all men is concerned to know it. He may not be to blame, even on this supposition, for being a soldier. The true character of war is one thing, and the true character of the warrior is quite another. The former must be decided by abstract reasoning and by comparing its deeds and principles with the deeds and principles sanctioned and taught by Christianity. The latter can only be decided by taking into consideration innumerable facts and circumstances which are peculiar to each individual case. And are we never to discuss openly the abstract merits of the world's practices, because certain persons who are engaged in them may regard such discussion as a personal offence? Are we never to set forth the horrors of war, and the burdens it imposes upon the world, when gentlemen wearing swords and epaulets may happen to be present? Must we be silent on the nature of the soldier's trade, because peaceable citizens deem it their duty to arm themselves from time to time, and with banners flying to march, with emblematic devices on their equipments, through our streets? We may respect their motives, and not approve their practice. We may think there are other and more Christian methods of keeping the peace than by "imitating the action of the tiger," without impugning the character of those who choose the latter. True, an old saying has it, "Love me, love my dog;" but we never heard of one which said "love me, love my tiger," "love me, love my bear-skin cap," or "love me, love my martial banner that flouts the sky."

The oration of Mr. Sumner is a very remarkable performance, and has excited much attention. It is a most elaborate discussion of the subject of war in all its bearings upon the well-being of a nation, and in all its relations with Christian duty. The several branches of the subject are handled with uncommon vigor of argument and amplitude of illustration. The style is copious, brilliant and glowing. At times it runs into an affluence of ornament, which a severe taste would perhaps require to be somewhat pruned. But

upon this point we should bear in mind, that the principles of taste allow a great latitude in the methods of discussing subjects; and that the infinite variety of individual organizations cannot be brought under one uniform system, one monotonous practice. It is the nature of some minds to reason with rigid and logical severity; to avoid all ornament, and retain only what is absolutely essential to the orderly exposition of a subject. They admit no illustrations by analogy; no support by authorities; no allusions to the opinions of others; no argument by metaphors. But because these are right in following out their own methods, we are not to infer that others are wrong for adopting different and opposite methods. There are those whose minds naturally and without effort embrace at once all the ideas that strictly belong to the subject they are handling, and all the associated ideas that illustrate and adorn it. An expansive mode of treatment, an abundance of allusion and quotation, a rounded and stately phraseology, are the natural forms in which minds of this description express themselves. Burke had gathered up the fruits of universal learning; and on every page of his immortal productions the rich results are manifested by a copiousness of imagery, a fulness, brilliancy and picturesqueness of periods, which make his style one of the noblest in the literature of England. Grotius, as everybody knows, adorned his learned discussions of the technicalities of public law by apt quotations from all the writers of Greece and Rome, using them, not for the sake of pedantic display, but to enforce his enlightened doctrines, by showing their coincidence with the sentiments of the illustrious poets, orators and philosophers of antiquity. The late Sir James Mackintosh manifested in the precious monuments of his genius — too few and fragmentary to give the world an adequate conception of the beauty and greatness of his mind — the same discursive taste, the same love of various and learned illustration, which marked the works of the distinguished men who had nurtured his mind and formed his taste.

We are not, therefore, prepared to join in the censures which we have heard thrown out upon Mr. Sumner's style, as encumbered with too much allusion, illustration and metaphor. Without exception, we believe, the allusions, illustrations and metaphors advance the discussion, or

strengthen the argument, or enforce the doctrine, or illuminate the picture; and the authorities cited in the foot-notes, and in the appendix, are useful guides to those who may desire to push their inquiries into the various topics of the discourse beyond its necessarily narrow limits.

After a very appropriate introduction, with suitable references to the character of the day, and to the memory of our ancestors, the orator announces his subject to be the inquiry, — "What in our age, are the true objects of national ambition — what is truly national glory, national honor — *what is the true grandeur of nations.*" Having made a few general remarks upon war, in which it is defined to be "a public, armed contest between nations, in order to establish *justice* between them," — a result which Mr. Sumner contends, is never secured, — he enters at once upon the discussion of the subject. It ought to be borne constantly in mind by the reader, that Mr. Sumner limits the argument to wars among Christian nations in the present age. He begins with an examination of "the character of war, or that part of our nature in which it has its origin," and shows that it is "a temporary adoption by men, of the character of wild beasts, emulating their ferocity, rejoicing like them in blood, and seeking, as with a lion's paw, to hold an asserted right." Mr. Sumner next proceeds to consider "the effects or consequences of this resort to brute force, in the pursuit of *justice.*" He shows that "war is utterly ineffectual to secure or advance the object at which it aims. The misery which it excites, contributes to no end, helps to establish no right, and therefore, in no respect determines justice between the contending nations." This is proved by the historical fact, that in the great wars which have desolated the world, for the most part, "peace has been gladly obtained on the basis of the condition of things before the war—the *status ante bellum.*" It is under this general head that Mr. Sumner introduces an ingenious and able parallel between the character of war as a means of establishing justice in the present age, and the private wars, particularly the judicial combat, or trial by battle, in the dark ages. Various prejudices which tend to uphold the practice of war, are next examined. These are the belief in its necessity; the practice of nations, past and present; the influence which

war has derived from the sanction of the Christian Church; the prejudices engendered by the army itself, particularly the point of honor, "early child of chivalry, the living representative in our day of an age of barbarism;" "a selfish and exaggerated love of country, leading to its physical aggrandizement at the expense of other countries;" and lastly, "the costly preparations for war, in time of peace." All these topics are handled with fearlessness and vigor. The discussion of the *point of honor* is admirable for the truth and severity with which that unchristian standard of human conduct is exposed. On the immense expenditures by the nations of the Christian world, for war, Mr. Sumner's statements, borne out in every instance by documents of unquestionable authority, will startle every reader. We pass over many important facts connected with this subject, and quote the following terrific array of figures.

"The number of soldiers now keeping the Peace of European Christendom, as a *standing army*, without counting the Navy, is upwards of two millions. Some estimates place it as high as three millions. The army of Great Britain exceeds 300,000 men; that of France 350,000; that of Russia 730,000, and is reckoned by some as high as 1,000,000; that of Austria about 275,000; that of Prussia 150,000. Taking the smaller number, suppose these two millions to require for their annual support an average sum of only $150 each, the result would be $300,000,000, for their sustenance alone; and reckoning one officer to ten soldiers, and allowing to each of the latter an English shilling a day, or $87 a year, for wages, and to the former an average salary of $500 a year, we should have for the pay of the whole no less than $256,000,000, or an appalling sum total for both sustenance and pay of $556,000,000. If the same calculation be made, supposing the forces to amount to three millions, the sum total will be $835,000,000! But to this enormous sum another still more enormous must be added on account of the loss sustained by the withdrawal of two millions of hardy, healthy men, in the bloom of life, from useful, productive labor. It has been supposed that it costs an average of $500 to rear a soldier; and that the value of his labor if devoted to useful objects would be $150 a year. The Christian Powers, therefore, in setting apart two millions of men as soldiers, sustain a loss of $1,000,000,000 on account of their training; and $300,000,000 annually, on account of their labor. So much for the cost of the standing army of European Christendom in time of Peace."

But the expenditures of the United States in preparations for war are still greater, in proportion to the other expenditures of the Federal Government. Of all the nations of Europe, the war expenditures bear the largest proportion in Great Britain to the general cost of supporting the government, amounting to 74 per cent of the whole; while in the United States, the expenditures in preparation for war, rise to the appalling proportion of 80 per cent. We give a single paragraph on this subject.

By a table* of the expenditures of the United States, exclusive of payments on account of the Public Debt, it appears, that, in the fifty-three years from the formation of our present Government, in 1789 down to 1843, there have been $246,620,055 spent for civil purposes, comprehending the expenses of the executive, the legislative, the judiciary, the post office, lighthouses, and intercourse with foreign governments. During this same period there have been $368,526,594, devoted to the military establishment, and $170,437,684 to the naval establishment; the two, forming an aggregate of $538,964,278. Deducting from this sum the appropriations during three years of war, and we shall find that more than *four hundred millions* were absorbed by vain preparations in time of peace for war. Add to this amount a moderate sum for the expenses of the militia during the same period, which a candid and able writer places at present at $50,000,000 a year; for the past years we may take an average of $25,000,000, and we shall have the enormous sum of $1,335,000,000 to be added to the $400,000,000; the whole amounting to *seventeen hundred and thirty-five millions* of dollars, a sum beyond the conception of human faculties, sunk under the sanction of the Government of the United States in mere *peaceful preparations for war*; more than *seven times* as much as was dedicated by the Government, during the same period, to all other purposes whatsoever."

The folly and wickedness of this lavish expense on objects which are opposed to the public morality, and which find no sanction in the religion we profess, language cannot adequately describe. The orator draws contrast, which if we had room, we should be glad to extract, that will open the eyes of the public to the enormous disproportion between the wasteful and ridiculous excess of expenditure upon these corrupting objects of our government's fostering care, and the most munificent pa-

* American Almanac for 1845, page 143.

tronage that has ever been extended in our country, to an institution of Peace — the oldest University established for the higher education of American citizens. Mr. Sumner urges the abandonment of our costly system of national defences. He inquires, under this branch of the argument, first, "What is the use of the standing army of the United States?" and the question is so disposed of, that it will not be easy for a martial logician to answer it. The navy, the fortifications, the militia of the United States pass successively under review, and are all condemned as useless consumers of the country's wealth and corrupters of its morals; they are all pronounced, on grounds of fact and reasoning which it is not easy to take away, "not the preservers of peace, but the provokers of war." The Christian doctrine of love is pressed home with an eloquence and force which it is impossible to resist. The oration closes with a lofty strain of eloquence, in which the leading principles of the whole discourse are summed up and recapitulated, in a manner so impressive and solemn, with such majesty of language and elevation of moral sentiment, that they must needs sink deeply into every heart.

To us the argument against war, under any conceivable circumstances, in the present age, seems to have an adamantine strength. We thank Mr. Sumner for venturing on such an occasion to do so good a work; we thank him for giving to the subject the whole force of his great abilities, his various learning, and his brilliant eloquence. He has furnished the advocates of peace with reasonings, facts, figures, and illustrations, which cannot fail to help forward the great cause of its universal establishment; a cause, on which the final triumph of Christianity so essentially depends. He, a man of the world, has exposed the monstrous fallacies of the world, with a force of argument to which there can be no reply; he, a layman, has addressed the Church in terms of righteous rebuke for her criminal disobedience to the teachings of the Prince of Peace, which she will do well to treasure up and deeply ponder. Let all good men read carefully and conscientiously what has so honestly, so ably, so learnedly and in so Christian a spirit, been laid before them by the orator of the Fourth of July.

C. C. F.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Margaret. A Tale of the Real and Ideal, Blight and Bloom, including sketches of a Place not before described, called Mons. Christi. Boston: Jordan & Wiley. 12mo. pp. 460.

The book bearing the above title contains an account, interesting on the whole, of the fortunes and character of a remarkable girl, of her progress from an obscure and painful condition to one of influence, respectability and refined happiness, from extreme ignorance to high wisdom. It is divided into three Parts. The first of these might have been withheld from the printer without essentially diminishing the value of the whole; or at least it might have been advantageously compressed into half a dozen pages. It abounds in dull and diffuse details of persons and things that possess few claims to the reader's attention, and some of which make but a small figure in the narrative. It is encumbered with dialogues of low life conducted without that humor, raciness, and spirit, which alone can make such conversation otherwise than tedious, if not quite revolting. We have been unable to discover, after a careful perusal, that it really teaches anything, unless it be that the manners of our people in the new country half a century ago were excessively rude, standing in undoubted need of the temperance reform, that a murderer may love flowers, and that a simple-hearted child will behave like a child in very different situations. The language that is recorded here, too, although we cannot deny that there are regions where it may be in use, is yet composed of some elements with which we must presume the gentlemen who compiled our standard dictionaries to have been unacquainted. Occasionally, however, we find passages of more than ordinary beauty. And while some of the descriptions are wearisome and intrusive, others are graphic and well-drawn; while vulgar images are sometimes introduced unnecessarily as figures of speech, others occur that are chaste and strikingly appropriate. The episode relating to Brückmann, is a happy instance of feeling delicately managed.

We allude to the faults of this portion of the volume the more particularly, because to a certain extent they appear throughout. There is here and there such an indulgence by the author of his faculty in the enumeration of particulars, such an extensive catalogue in natural history, as almost to give one the impression that his *forte* lies in minute details. We also thought we detected in various places a leaning to the fantastic, the strange,

in fact, to oddity, which is always a blemish in a true work of art. We are aware there is a certain class of persons that greatly admire and mightily extol whatever in books or characters inclines to eccentricity. Among these are some who are ready to affirm that singularity is an infallible mark of genius, and that common sense, modesty, what Cicero calls *constantia*, and a respect for the classical rules and models of composition, are qualities that can by no means enter into the character of a great writer. But wiser men will notwithstanding continue for the present to believe that no writer can be truly great who despises them. A few cases of trifling inconsistency in the development of this story might be noticed, — as where Margaret is made to do a thing she is represented as so manifestly incompetent to, as giving a ball. It might well be doubted, too, whether the first conversations of Mr. Evelyn, being not remarkably plain, were calculated so eminently to clear up the theological ideas of an uninstructed young female. And, to complete our censure, we cannot conceive why the flash and profane language of vicious characters, should be suffered to mar a book, in other respects, of unexceptionable purity.

However, as we have intimated, the farther one advances in the reading of the volume, the more do imperfections vanish and excellencies appear. While the first Part excited in us something very like disgust, the latter portions awakened a strong feeling of admiration. The unnaturalness and stiffness of the beginning wear off. Earnest thoughts are uttered, and earnest sympathies are engaged. Merely as a romance, the work is not perhaps more than respectable; but as a record of many just ideas and lofty sentiments, it stands far above the level of most of the books which the press "groans daily to deliver." The author has, clearly, a deep, genuine love for his race, and a hearty desire to serve well the interests of humanity. Nor is he without a marked degree of originality and skill in the art of collecting and combining the materials of a readable production. The success which we doubt not will attend his effort, will be owing in large measure to his talent for apprehending and presenting subjects in the concrete, — a talent that is liable, if not guarded, to pass, as we have seen, into excess. "Margaret" leaving her home at "the Pond," and "Chilion" in the jail, afford scenes and passages of uncommon pathos, and are most felicitously sketched. The chapter on Christianity is full of eloquence and power and truth. We do not often meet with finer illustrations and statements of the nature, character and real mission of Christ, and the significance of the Gospel. This, together with the kindred passages in the third Part, and the description of the effect of ecclesiastical formalities and pious cant on the mind of a sincere and pure maiden, may be regard-

ed as constituting the chief substance and worth of the book. Here is the centre and essence of the whole production. And although we cannot help thinking that the limits of good taste and decorum are sometimes overstepped, in the neglected child's rather offensive talk on subjects and beings that we can never too sacredly reverence, yet there is much that is both true and instructive in the natural rebellion of her soul against the dogmas and absurdities of creed-worshippers, against Pharisaism and all religious pretension. Pure goodness is beautifully contrasted with the mockery of it. Margaret's letters, at the close, are delightful. They give a picture of what may be considered almost a perfect state of society, and the church. They show how the kingdom of Christ veritably comes on earth. They preach liberal Christianity, in the highest sense. In a noble spirit, they heighten our conception of what the New Testament means, and in striking and animating forms set forth the exalted dignity of those who are ready to carry on, with brave and trusting hearts, that work of love which Jesus began. H.

Morning and Evening Meditations, for every Day in a Month. London. 1845. 12mo. pp. 227.

We presume that we violate no secrecy in saying, that for this little volume we are indebted to Miss Mary Carpenter, daughter of the late Dr. Carpenter of Bristol, England. It is "a first offering of love and gratitude to the memory of a revered father." The plan and arrangement of the work are somewhat new, and admirably adapted to the purposes of Christian devotion. It does not profess to be a Manual of prayer; but it is — what in our view is far better — highly suggestive of devotional thoughts and fitted to awaken the spirit of prayer, and therefore is in the best sense a Guide to prayer. It affords, for daily use, and also for various particular occasions, reflections founded on passages of Scripture, followed by well-chosen pieces of poetry in harmony with the subject of meditation. These are in all cases of a moderate length. The compiler has manifested judgment and taste and a catholic spirit in her selections, and the pieces for which she, and other members of her family, and some immediate friends are responsible add very much to the value of the book. We hope to see it soon republished here. We notice one or two errors in the Index of authors, which would easily be corrected in a new edition. The piece for Monday evening of the first week, attributed to H. Ware, is by James Montgomery. That for Wednesday evening of the second week, marked anonymous, is by Mrs. Gilman of Charleston, S. C. The volume has our cordial approval, and the editor our sincere thanks. M.

Horæ Biblicæ; being a connected Series of Notes on the Text and Literary History of the Bibles, or Sacred Books of the Jews and Christians; and on the Bibles or Books accounted Sacred by the Mahometans, Hindoos, Parsees, Chinese, and Scandinavians. Volume the first, containing a connected Series of Notes on the Original Text, Early Versions, and Printed Editions of the Old and New Testament. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 108.

It should have been stated in an advertisement or preface, that this is a republication of part of a work of the late Charles Butler, published some years ago in England. The title of the reprint differs slightly from that of the edition before us, which is the fifth, issued in 1817. One or two other minute discrepancies we have observed, not of a nature, however, to impair the merit of the republication. The book is necessarily a dry one, but contains a great deal of information in a condensed form, and will prove valuable, not simply to the theological student, but also to the Sunday school teacher, and in fact to intelligent Christians generally. Butler was a Roman Catholic, but an enlightened man, and in the main a fair and impartial critic. L.

Miscellaneous Writings of George W. Burnap, Author of Lectures to Young Women, etc. Collected and revised by the Author. Baltimore. 1845. 12mo. pp. 343.

This volume contains several of Mr. Burnap's publications originally issued in separate pamphlets, some of which have never before fallen under our eye. They are on various subjects, literary as well as religious, and in bringing them together and presenting them to the public in a less perishable form than that in which they before existed, Mr. Burnap has enlarged the sphere of their usefulness, besides gratifying those who have already learned to regard him as one of our best writers, alike for correctness of thought and purity of language. L.

Epitaphs from the Old Burying-Ground in Cambridge. With Notes. By William Thaddeus Harris, Junior Sophister in Harvard College. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1845. 12mo. pp. 192.

This "transcript" of all the epitaphs in the Cambridge burial-ground "from the earliest date to the year 1800," with the names of those to whose memory monuments have been since erected, may have little interest except for readers who connect domestic or academical associations with the ground which Mr. Harris has so carefully traversed; but as a memorial

which such persons will value, and as an evidence of his antiquarian diligence, we esteem the volume worthy of respectful mention, and accept with gratitude the contribution he has here made to our "monumental literature." The earliest inscription in the Cambridge yard, — over the grave of "Ann Eriton, aged 77 years," — bears the date of 1653. We sympathise with Mr. Harris in his feelings of regret at the "desolate appearance" which this burial-ground, in the midst of one of our wealthy and populous towns, is allowed to retain. It is creditable neither to the people of Cambridge nor to the University, that the resting-place of so many honored both in the local and the literary history of the place should be neglected and misused, as we have often had occasion to observe is the case in our walks over this spot. G.

The Young Ladies' Elocutionary Reader; containing a Selection of Reading Lessons, by ANNA U. RUSSELL: *with Introductory Rules and Exercises in Elocution, adapted to Female Readers*, by WILLIAM RUSSELL, author of "Lessons in Enunciation," etc. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 480.

Introduction to the Young Ladies' Elocutionary Reader: containing a Selection of Reading Lessons; together with the Rudiments of Elocution, adapted to Female Readers. By WILLIAM and ANNA U. RUSSELL, Authors of the above-mentioned Reader. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 252.

MR. RUSSELL'S reputation and success as a teacher, long known and universally respected in our community, are a sufficient security for the character of that part of these works which comes from his pen; and the selections for which we are indebted to his daughter, are made not only with the strict regard to purity of sentiment which should mark every book intended for female readers, but with that attention to the suitableness of the pieces as exercises for those who would accomplish themselves in a valuable, but too much neglected art, which will recommend them to use in both schools and families. There may not seem to have been an absolute need of this addition to the number of good books of a similar kind which have been published among us within a few years, but it increases the variety of choice, and in some respects these are preferable to the works by which they have been preceded. We regret to see in the larger volume that vicious system of punctuation adopted, now so common in American books, by which *commas* are multiplied, not only to the annoyance of the eye, but in utter disregard of the closest connexion of thought. G.

The Faith of the Unitarian Christian explained, justified, and distinguished. A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the Unitarian Church, Montreal, on Sunday, May 11, 1845. By EZRA S. GANNETT, Minister of the Federal Street Church, Boston. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 40.

Address delivered at the Laying of the Corner-stone of the Second Church, on Thursday Morning, May 30, 1844. By CHANDLER ROBBINS, Minister of the Second Church and Society. Boston: I. R. Butts. 1844. 8vo. pp. 10.

A Sermon delivered before the Proprietors of the Second Church, Wednesday, September 17, 1845, *at the Dedication of their new House of Worship.* By their Minister, CHANDLER ROBBINS. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 40.

A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the First Church and Society in Somerville, Mass., on Wednesday, Sept. 3, 1845. By GEORGE E. ELLIS, Pastor of the Harvard Church, Charlestown. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 8vo. pp. 24.

Anti-Supernaturalism. A Sermon preached before the Senior Class of the Divinity School in Harvard University, July 13, 1845. By ANDREW P. PEABODY, Pastor of the South Church, Portsmouth, N. H. Cambridge: John Owen. 1845. 8vo. pp. 26.

Discourse occasioned by the Death of the Hon. Joseph Story, LL. D., delivered in the Church of the First Parish in Cambridge, on Sunday, September 14, 1845. By WILLIAM NEWELL, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge. Cambridge: Metcalf & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 23.

A Discourse commemorative of the Life and Character of the Hon. Joseph Story, LL. D., an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Dane Professor of Law in Harvard University; pronounced on the eighteenth day of September, A. D. 1845, *at the request of the Corporation of the University, and the Members of the Law School.* By SIMON GREENLEAF, LL. D., Royal Professor of Law in Harvard University. Boston: Little & Brown. 8vo. pp. 48.

Eulogy on the Hon. Benjamin Russell, delivered before the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Massachusetts, March 10, 1845. By Brother FRANCIS BAYLIES. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 66.

The Connection between Science and Religion. An Oration delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Harvard University, August 28, 1845. By ANDREW P. PEABODY. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 8vo. pp. 29.

A Poem pronounced before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Cambridge, August 28, 1845. By CHARLES T. BROOKS. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 8vo. pp. 36.

An Address delivered before the American Peace Society, at its Annual Meeting, May 26, 1845. By WILLIAM JAY. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 31.

Emancipation in the British West Indies, August 1, 1834. *An Address, delivered in the First Presbyterian Church in Syracuse, on the First of August,* 1845. By SAMUEL J. MAY, Pastor of the Church of Messiah, in Syracuse. Syracuse. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

The Unconstitutionality of Slavery. By LYSANDER SPOONER. Boston: B. Marsh. 1845. 8vo. pp. 156.

Essay on the Philosophical Character of Channing. By ROWLAND G. HAZARD. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 40.

Memoir of James Grahame, LL. D., Author of the History of the United States of North America. Originally prepared for the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. By JOSIAH QUINCY. Boston: Little & Brown. 1845. 8vo. pp. 51.

An Inquiry into the Views, Principles, Services, and Influences of the Leading Men in the Origination of our Union, and in the Formation and early Administration of our Present Government. By THADDEUS ALLEN. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 86.

On the Introduction of Natural History as a regular classic in our Seminaries. An Address delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, at Portland, Me., August, 1844. By CHARLES BROOKS, Boston. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1844. 12mo. pp. 24.

An Answer to "Questions addressed to the Rev. T. Parker and his Friends." By a "FRIEND INDEED." Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

Answers to Questions contained in Mr. Parker's Letter to the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. By ONE *NOT* OF THE ASSOCIATION. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 39.

WE are compelled to dismiss the above enumerated sermons and pamphlets, most of which have accumulated upon our hands within the last two months, with a few brief words of notice, though some of them deserve much more. — In the Dedication Discourse at Montreal the preacher treats of the topics which naturally suggested themselves on the occasion, — the "import" of the name Unitarian, "the reasons for adopting it," and the

"differences" it indicates between Unitarian Christians and others, believers or unbelievers. — Mr. Robbins's Address at laying the corner-stone of his new church is short and simple, as such addresses should be, and full of the spirit of the occasion. In his Dedication Discourse, from the text, "My Father's House," he takes for his leading topic the "Christian idea of the value and uses of the place of worship." In some beautiful passages, and with much fervor, he speaks of the "sentiments of veneration and love" which intertwine themselves with "places and times," investing them with sacredness, before he proceeds to other topics more usual on such occasions, with which he closes; giving some interesting "reminiscences" in an appendix. — The sentiment on which worship depends, the "historical facts" with which "*our* worship is connected," and the uses of worship, are among the topics impressively treated by Mr. Ellis in his Dedication Discourse, which is full of just and suggestive thought. — Mr. Peabody's Sermon compares "the anti-supernatural theory of religion" with "the theory which admits miraculous evidence," "in a philosophical, spiritual, and practical point of view," — to the advantage, in each instance, of the latter; and closes with remarks upon the impropriety of an exchange of *ministerial* offices between persons holding such widely different opinions. The discourse is written in the author's best manner — clear, calm, and forcible. — In Mr. Newell's discourse the intellectual traits of Judge Story, the high stations he filled with so much ability and success, his writings, his private and social virtues, and his religious character, are all impressively touched upon, and the whole leaves on the mind the calm, beautiful image of a great and good man. — Professor Greenleaf's Discourse contains a clear and succinct account of the public life, and especially of the professional services and character, and the various publications of his lamented colleague, written in a style of unusual chasteness, warm with the emotions of sincere admiration and personal friendship. — The Eulogy on Hon. Benjamin Russell, long known as the editor of the Centinel, contains some rich gleanings of Revolutionary anecdote, and is altogether a performance worthy of both perusal and preservation. — Mr. Peabody, in his Phi Beta Kappa Oration, proposes first, to exhibit the "essential agency," in the work of scientific investigation, "of just and adequate religious ideas and sentiments, and then to justify his position by a cursory survey of the history of science." There seems to us to be a want of sufficient qualification or development in some of the remarks, but the performance bears the stamp of the earnest and religious mind from which it proceeded. — Mr. Brooks's Poem may not give in the perusal the satisfaction with which it was heard, but it contains passages which every one

will pronounce much above the ordinary accomplishment of anniversary bards. Some persons may object to the machinery of the poem as stale and heavy, yet it is on the whole managed with good effect; and, with some faulty lines, the production is creditable to Mr. Brooks as a versifier and an imaginative writer. — Judge Jay strenuously pleads the cause of peace, points out the inconsistencies of Christians in regard to war, and concludes with some valuable statistical notices. — There is a little too much personal panegyric on the living in Mr. May's Address to suit our taste, yet is the performance, on the whole, a stirring one, full of the eloquence of truth. — Mr. Spooner's pamphlet is written with ability, though we do not think he proves the point, or points, which he is anxious to establish. It is entitled, however, to the attention of those who are qualified to form an enlightened judgment respecting the bearing of our national Constitution, and our subsequent or previous legislation on the subject of Slavery. — The "Essay on the Philosophical character of Channing" contains the thoughts of a fresh, vigorous mind, many of which are highly "suggestive," and whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the justness of the analysis, there can be none as to the author's quick sensibility to "the true, the beautiful and the good," or his ability to estimate them in their relation to the intellect and the life. — President Quincy's "Memoirs of James Grahame," though brief, is a valuable contribution to our biographical literature, and does full justice to the "Author of the History of the United States of North America," words, which, in his last illness, Grahame requested should be engraven on the stone which marked his grave. — Mr. Allen's pamphlet appears to be the first of a series meant to consist almost altogether of extracts from Journals of Congress, Memoirs, Letters etc. of the "Revolutionary times." The work will contain a great mass of useful information in an authentic form. We hope that it will receive the encouragement it deserves. — Professor Brooks urges both the practicability and the benefit of making natural history a branch of instruction in our higher seminaries with earnestness and force. — The Answer to "Questions addressed to Rev. T. Parker and his Friends" contains short and somewhat tart replies to many of those questions, but we doubt whether the cause of truth and goodness is much promoted by this sort of warfare. — The "Answers to Questions contained in Mr. Parker's Letter" are not thorough enough, we suspect, to satisfy Mr. Parker, nor will they, in every particular, as we think, meet the approbation of all those to whom that letter is addressed. Parts of the pamphlet, however, certainly exhibit much force and justness of remark.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — We rejoice that our present record of ministerial changes may be unusually small. The only instance which has come to our knowledge is that of Rev. Mr. Weiss of Watertown, who we regret should have been compelled so soon after entering on his professional duties to relinquish them, in consequence of ill health. — Several installations and ordinations have occurred, notices of which will be found under the proper head, and two or three members of the last class from the Divinity School will be ordained as pastors in the course of a few weeks. — Rev. Mr. Thomas has accepted the invitation of the Broadway Unitarian Society in South Boston to remain with them as their minister. — Rev. Mr. Farley, who recently left Eastport, has taken the first steps towards gathering a congregation at East Boston, where he now preaches in a suitable hall every Sunday. — Rev. Mr. Adam, formerly of Cambridge, has acceded to the request of the Unitarian Society at Toronto, Canada, that he would remain with them through the winter. Their success in securing a permanent establishment has exceeded their most confident hopes. A purchase has been made, at a very moderate price, of a meetinghouse formerly occupied by a Methodist congregation, and Mr. Adam, after preaching to them a few Sundays, obtained on a visit to Montreal and the United States the promise of a sufficient subscription to enable the society to pay for the building and to put it in good repair.

In this city the dedication of the house erected by the Second Church in place of the one in which they had so long worshipped has occurred since our last publication. The house has been finished in a style of more than usual elegance, and while the interior exhibits the elaborate ornament of the Gothic architecture, the tower and lofty steeple add much to the goodly appearance of our city. — The Hollis Street meetinghouse having been closed through the summer for repairs, has been reopened within a few weeks, and the usual religious services been resumed. — The Congregational [Trinitarian] church in Green Street have been obliged by pecuniary embarassments to sell their meetinghouse; which has been bought by the society under the care of Rev. Mr. Towne, who have in consequence relinquished their purpose of erecting a new house on the land they had purchased in Hawkins Street. Rev. Dr. Jenks has resigned his connexion with the "Messiah Church," a portion of whose members have taken the hall in the Tremont Temple lately occupied by Mr. Towne's congregation, and continue to worship under the ministry of Rev. Mr. Chapman. — Rev. George Richards has been ordained as colleague pastor with Rev. Mr. Rogers over the Central [Trinitarian] church. — A singular change has taken place in the use made of two former places of worship, each of which had acquired some notoriety in the religious history of Boston. The "Marlboro' Chapel" has been converted into a hall for the exhibition of a Chinese Museum; and the "Tabernacle" in Howard Street has been remodelled and opened for dramatic performances.

Installations and Ordinations. — Rev. Stephen Greenleaf Bulfinch, late of Washington, D. C., was installed at Nashville, N. H., as minister of "the Unitarian church of Nashua and Nashville," September 17, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Putnam of Roxbury, Mass., from Matthew xi. 28; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Miles of Lowell, Mass.; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, Mass.; the Right Hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr. Peabody of New Bedford, Mass.; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Osgood of Providence, R. I.; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Babbidge of Pepperell, Mass., Cutler of Peterboro', N. H., and Morse of Tyngsboro', Mass.

Rev. William Morse, late of Marlboro', was installed over the First Congregational Church and Society in Tyngsboro', Mass., September 25, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Ellis of Charlestown, from John v. 43; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. White of Littleton; the Right Hand of Fellowship was given by Rev. Mr. Babbidge of Pepperell; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Miles of Lowell; and the other services by Rev. Messrs. Bulfinch of Nashville, N. H., Chandler of Shirley, and Kinsley of Stow.

Rev. William C. Tenney was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Kennebunk, Me., October 7, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H., from Luke xvii. 20; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Nichols of Portland, Me.; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Wheeler of Topsham, Me.; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Coolidge of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Waterston of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Smith, Nichols of Saco, and Wheeler.

Rev. Ephraim Nute Jr., recently from Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Petersham, Mass., October 15, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston, from Hebrews xiii. 17; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Thompson of Barre; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Willson of Grafton; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; and the other services, by Rev. Mr. Gage, late pastor of the church, and Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield.

Dedications. — The Congregational meetinghouse in Somerville, Mass., was dedicated September 3, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Ellis of Charlestown, from 1 Kings viii. 27; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Hodges of Cambridge; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Stetson of Medford, Newell of Cambridge, and Gray of Boston.

The meetinghouse just erected by the Unitarian Society in Pomfret, Vt., was dedicated September 11, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Livermore, of Keene, N. H., from Genesis xxviii. 17 and 1 Timothy ii. 5; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Willis of Walpole, N. H.; and the other services were conducted by Elders Hazen and Kidder of Woodstock, Vt., Rev. Mr. Willis, and Rev. Messrs. Streeter and Daggett of Woodstock.

The meetinghouse recently erected by the Second Church in Boston, Mass., on the site of their former house of worship, was dedicated September 17, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Robbins, the pastor, from John ii. 16; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Dr. Parkman of Boston; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Chelsea, Rev. Dr. Pierce of Brookline, and Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston.

The meetinghouse of the First Congregational Society in Brooklyn, Conn., having been repaired and remodelled, so as to present in the interior an entirely new appearance, was dedicated anew October 1, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston, from Romans iv. 13; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. May of Leicester, Mass., and the other Services were conducted by Rev. Mr. Snow, pastor of the church, and Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Harvard University. — The resignation of President Quincy and the death of Judge Story have deprived this institution of two of its most efficient officers. Mr. Quincy closed his official connexion with the College on the last Commencement day, when resolutions expressing the sense entertained by the Board of Overseers of his past services were presented to him in public by Governor Briggs. Resolutions of a similar character had been passed by the Corporation and the Academical Faculty. The duties of the Presidency are discharged, during the vacancy in the office, by Professor Walker. — The loss which the University has sustained in the removal of Judge Story is doubly severe, as he had not only through his connexion with the Law School as Dane Professor raised it to a state of great prosperity, but had long been a member of the Corporation. Besides the commemorative Discourse by Professor Greenleaf of which we have taken notice in another place, the members of the Suffolk Bar have requested Hon. Daniel Webster to deliver an Eulogy on this distinguished civilian, whose name sheds such honor on American jurisprudence. — An Eulogy on the late Henry Ware, D. D., Hollis Professor of Divinity, was delivered at Cambridge on Sunday evening, September 28, by Dr. Palfrey; of which we need only say in anticipation of its appearance from the press, that it was an altogether worthy tribute to the memory of a revered instructor and friend.

Notwithstanding the loss of such valuable and devoted guardians of its welfare, the University was never in a more prosperous state than at the present moment. The Freshman Class in the College is unusually large, and the number of students in the other departments of the institution shows that the public are not insensible to the advantages they afford for gaining a professional education. The Treasurer's "Statement" for the financial year 1844–45 exhibits a very satisfactory state of the general, as well as a judicious management of the specific, funds. The Expenditure of the year has been kept below the amount of Income, while aid has been extended to students needing such assistance, and additions have been made to the Library. We commend one sentence in this "Statement" to the

notice of certain persons who may be glad to plead ignorance as an excuse for past misrepresentation. "The funds of the Theological Institution," says the Treasurer, "like those of the Law and Medical Schools, are entirely distinct from those of the College; and not a dollar of the money given for the support or instruction of the undergraduates has ever been diverted from its legitimate purpose to the benefit of either of the Schools connected with the College." The erection of the Observatory has been carried on the last year, and the work is nearly completed. Every means has been taken to provide a structure that by the solidity of its foundations and the convenience of its arrangements should be adequate for the purpose to which it will be devoted, while all needless expense has been carefully avoided. In consequence of the liberal donation of Hon. David Sears, the building will bear the name of the Sears Tower.

New Works. — Professor Stuart of Andover has just sent from the press a "Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon," in one volume, 12mo, a notice of which, prepared for this number, we have been obliged to omit. — A second American edition has been published of the "Memoirs of Oberlin," with the Introduction written by the late Mr. Ware, and with some "additions." We need say nothing in commendation of this book. — Allen, Morrill & Wardwell of Andover have published "A Selection from the Writings" of Bishop Hall, edited by A. H. Clapp of the Andover Theological Seminary, which appears to have been prepared with care, and will be an acceptable volume to those who love to read the old English practical divinity. — A volume has been sent to us from a London publishing house, entitled "Sketches of Sermons on Christian Missions: original and selected;" of which, as containing either specimens of preaching or discussions of themes relevant to the subject indicated by the title, we cannot speak in terms that would be agreeable to the compiler. — Rev. Dr. Beard of Manchester, England, whose literary industry amidst his professional duties fills us with amazement, has issued the first number of "The People's Dictionary of the Bible," in 32 pages, 8vo, double columns; — a work, which "will be completed in about thirty numbers, issued monthly, forming two volumes." Of this we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

We are glad to announce that Rev. Dr. Noyes of Cambridge has in press "A new Translation of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, with Introductions and Notes." This volume will be a continuation of Professor Noyes's translations of the books of the Old Testament, of which Job, Psalms, and the Prophets have been already published. — A new Hymn-book for the use of Christian congregations, compiled by Rev. Mr. Briggs of Plymouth, has just been published. A revised and enlarged edition of the New York Collection is also nearly ready to appear. Of these, as well as the other Collections recently made, we hope to speak at large in our next number. — Mr. R. W. Emerson has in press a volume of Poems, which will be welcomed by his friends. — "The Harbinger" is the title of a weekly paper, of 16 pages, 4to., "devoted to social and political progress," and "published simultaneously at New York and Boston, by the Brook Farm Phalanx." Although we do not accept the theory of social reorganization which it is intended to support, we recognise

with pleasure the hand of a friend, and a former contributor to our journal, in the editorial department. — We copy the following announcement from a number of the Phalanx published a few weeks since. "We are authorised to state that the translation of Fourier's Writings is in progress, and that it will probably be ready for publication in the course of the present summer. George Ripley, President of the Brook Farm Phalanx, and A. Brisbane, who is at present there, are engaged on it."

OBITUARY.

Rev. James Blodgett died at Lexington, Mass., July 16, 1845, aged 33 years. Mr. Blodgett was a graduate of Harvard University of the class of 1841. By his industry during the last years of his College life, he was enabled to become immediately a member of the Middle Class in the Divinity School, and left Cambridge two years later, in 1843. At this period his health was feeble, and for the sake of its improvement he entered on a missionary tour at the West. The change and travel were partially successful, and he returned to New England with a fairer prospect of life and usefulness. He was soon invited to preach in Deerfield, where his services proved so acceptable that he was almost unanimously requested to remain as pastor over the First Congregational church in that ancient town. He was ordained to this sacred charge, January 17, 1844. From this time his prospects darkened. The symptoms of disease returned upon him in aggravated forms, and after a ministry of little more than a year, he finally resigned his place. He retired to Lexington among his friends, and there passed his remaining days.

This seems a short history; but worth is not measured by periods of time. Our brother who has left us did but little as the world estimates labor. *Here*, his was peculiarly a preparatory work. This was well done. He put aside obstacles, and moulded many adverse circumstances to the higher purposes of his individual will. He was tried by poverty and sickness. These are stern teachers, and they gave to him the virtues necessary to meet and bear them—hope, and perseverance, and a faith that lives in the future. Hence he so cheerfully bore the disappointment of an early surrender of his cherished plans, and at last so calmly went to his rest. His life was Christian, and death only added a single new evidence. An esteemed and venerable friend of the writer of this notice speaks of him as follows: — "Some of the traits of his character were very conspicuous. Among these was a mental discernment, prompt and clear, a ready apprehension of the bearing and force of an argument, and a freedom from that pride of opinion which would prevent him from yielding when convinced. He had a high standard of justice and generosity, was inflexible in his purpose of doing his duty, and though mild and candid in his expressions, he had no fear of consequences in uttering what he thought true and right. A saying of his was perfectly characteristic: 'I would rather lose my will than be afraid to use it.' His style of preaching was plain and eminently practical." Solemn but simple is the admonition that comes again to his brethren — to preach and to live Christ. C.

Hon. Joseph Story, one of the associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Dane Professor of Law in Harvard University, died at Cambridge, Mass., September 10, 1845, aged 65 years. This distinguished man was born in Marblehead, where he received his early education. Entering at a somewhat advanced standing, he was graduated with honor in Harvard University in 1798, in the same class of which the late William E. Channing and Joseph Tuckerman were members. He early adopted the law as the profession of his choice, and was admitted to the Bar in 1801; was elected in 1805 one of the Representatives of the then town of Salem in the Legislature of Massachusetts, to which (except for a short interval in 1809, when he was chosen to supply a vacancy in the representation of his District in Congress) he was annually re-elected till his promotion to the Bench; and was also for a short term the Speaker of that House. In 1811, at the age of thirty-two, he was appointed by Mr. Madison one of the associate Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; and "never," says Professor Greenleaf in his faithful eulogy, "was this honor so early achieved; never more purely and worthily worn." In 1818 he was elected an Overseer of Harvard College, and in 1825 was chosen a Fellow of the Corporation. In 1829, he accepted the Dane Professorship of Law in Cambridge University, being expressly designated to this office by its munificent founder; and in the faithful and honorable discharge of the duties of this office and of his still higher trust as a Judge he spent the remainder of his life, which was closed after a short but painful illness, just before the completion of his sixty-sixth year.

No event of the kind has called forth a deeper interest or sincerer grief throughout the nation than the death of this distinguished and lamented man. Tributes not less just than eloquent, have been offered to his memory by his professional associates, who were competent witnesses of his honorable career, and by others, his friends and fellow-citizens, who knew or had heard of his character and services. The Bar and the Pulpit, the Tribunals of justice and the Schools of learning have spoken; and their united and heartfelt testimony conspires with the public voice in deploring the loss of a learned and upright judge, of a wise and honored teacher, of a virtuous and patriotic citizen, of a warm and faithful friend, and above all, of a sincere and exemplary Christian. Judge Story was firm and open in his attachment to the principles of Liberal Christianity, and was from its formation a Vice President, and afterwards President, of the American Unitarian Association. His calm and enlightened submission to the Divine will was proved in hours of domestic bereavement, and in the prospect of a departure from life at a time when in view of cherished plans of usefulness life must have been most dear to him. P.

*** Religious and Literary Intelligence which we had hoped to give in this number is necessarily excluded.

INDEX.

A.

Alexander's Power, from the Persian, 335.
Allegories etc. for Children, 134.
Allen, T., An Inquiry etc. by, 426.
Al-Sirat, from Rückert, 335.
American Unitarian Association, 136.
Anniversaries, the, 136, 140.
Answers to Questions addressed to Boston Association, 426.
Answer to Questions addressed to T. Parker, 426.
Arnald, Commentary of, 116.
Atonement, the, History of the Doctrine of, 1—23 — importance of, 3 — three periods, 4—mythic period, 5 — the Fathers, ib. — Scholasticism, 8 — Anselm, 9 — third period, the Reformation, 12 — Lutherans, 13 — Socinus, 14— Grotius, 17—general remarks, 19.

B.

Bailey, P. J. See *Festus*.
Baur, F. C., on the Atonement, 1.
Baylies, F., Eulogy by, 425.
Beard, J. R., Voices of the Church. See *Strauss*.
Berry Street Ministerial Conference, 138.
Blodgett, Rev. James. See *Obituary*.
Brazer, J., Discourse by, 278.
British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 287.
Brooks, C., Lecture by, 426.
Brooks, C. T., Poem by, 425.
Burnap, G. W., Miscellaneous Writings of, 421.
Burns, retranslation from, 192.
Bush, G., Inquiry into Scriptural Psychology, by, 274.
Butler, C., Horæ Biblicæ, by, 421.

C.

Cambridge Divinity School, 279, 308.
Charlotte Elizabeth, article on, 28–52 — personal history of, 29 — writings, 43—juvenile books, 44 —fictitious, 46 — historical, 47— theological, 48—agency of Satan, 49.
Child, L. M., Letters by, 131.
Christ, Moral Character of, article on, 236–248—how formed, 237— infidel theory, 238—anti-supernatural, ib.—Trinitarian, 239 — Unitarian, ib.—true theory, 241— moral influence of truth, 243 — Christ's character a revelation, 247.
Christian Hymns for Public and Private Worship, 132.
Christian Peace, or Christian Union? 53–63—the former preferred, 53—reasons of preference, 56—cure of religious dissensions, 60.
Church Music, 102–116—musical expression, 103—distinctness of utterance, 105—vocal and instrumental music, 107 — pronunciation, 109—particular expression, 111 — emphasis, 112 — hymns, 115.
Collation, the, 137.

D.

Dana, Mary S. B., Letters by, reviewed, 389 — 407 — adaptation of Unitarianism to woman, 390— services of woman to Unitarianism, 392—author's conversion to Unitarianism, 394 — occasion of the Letters, 395—their character, 396 — controversy, 397 — criticism, application of the term God, 399—letter to her parents, 401—

Calvinism, 404—subjects of Letters, 405.
Dedications, 142, 428.
Denominations, Religious, 282.
Dewey, O., Berry Street Address of, 82. See *Rights*.
Downing, A. J., on Fruits and Fruit Trees, 276.

E.

Ecclesiastical Record, 135, 279, 427.
Edes, E. H., Rev. See *Obituary*.
Edes, R. S., Discourse by, 278.
Ella Herbert, 134.
Ellis, G. E., Discourse by, 425.

F.

Farr, Rev. J., 379—389 — his writings, 379—personal history, 381—early life, ib.—preparation for College, 382 — professional studies, 383—ordination, 384—ministerial life, 385—character and habits, 386—extracts from Mss. 387—death, 389.
Festus, a poem, reviewed, 365 — 379—its extraordinary merit, 365 — extract, ib.—characteristics of the author, 366—quick sensibility, ib.—faculty of "outsight," 368—wealth of metaphor, 369—character of the poem, 370 — its theology, 373 — philosophy, 375 — moral characteristics, 376 — advice to the poet, 377.
Fine Arts in America, 314—330—the useful and the beautiful, 315—nature of our institutions, 317—patronage, 318—genius, 319—national character, 321—the Puritan character, 322—sensitiveness of Americans, 325—American artists, 326—creative faculty, 328—the future, 330.
Fitch, J., Life of, 273.
Frost, the, lines on, 331.
Funeral Bell, lines on, 331.

G.

Gannett, E. S., Discourse by, 424.
Grahame, J. See *Quincy*.
Greenleaf, S., Eulogy by, 426.
Griswold, Bishop, Stone's memoir of, 248—260—character of the biography, 249—office of bishop, 250—early life, 251—admission to orders, 255—is chosen bishop, 257—his episcopal character, 258—personal qualities, 259.

H.

Harris, W. T., Epitaphs by, 421.
Harvard College, article on, 261—272 — President Quincy, 261—expenses, 263—charge of sectarianism, 264—alleged proofs, 265 — their insufficiency 266 — freedom from sectarianism, 267 — Unitarianism, 268 — the College and the Commonwealth, 269 — proposed changes, 271.
Harvard University, 429.
Hazard, R. G., Essay on Channing by, 426.
Hebrew Tales, 134.
Horæ Biblicæ. See *Butler*.
Hutchinson, Anne, Life of, 273.
Hymns, 115.

I.

Immortality, 23—28—influence of and belief in, 23—its place in the instruction of the young, 25.
Intelligence, Religious, 135, 279, 427. Literary, 429.

J.

Jay, J., address by, 426.

L.

Lamson, A., Address of, before Alumni of Divinity School, 289.
Lane, J. F. W., Treatise on the Voice translated by, 277.
Life, lines on, 194.
Longfellow, H. W., Poets and Poetry of Europe by. See *Poets*.
Lord's Supper, 140.
Lowman, Commentary of, 116.
Lowth, Commentary of, 116.

M.

Mann, H., Answer to Rejoinder, by, 277.
Margaret, a Tale, noticed, 418.
Martineau, H., Five Years of Youth by, 134.
May, S. J., Address by, 426.
Meadville Theological School, 281.
Miles, H. A., History of Lowell, by, 275.
Mind among the Spindles, 275.
Morison, J. H., Life of Smith, by. See *Smith*.

Morning and Evening Meditations, 420.

N.

Neander. See *Rose*.
Nevin, J. W., Introduction to Schaf, by. See *Schaf*.
Newell, W., Discourse by, 425.
New Works, 430.
No Heart Alone, lines on, 191.

O.

Obituary: — Leverett Saltonstall, 143—Rev. Edward H. Edes, 144 — Rev. James Blodgett, 431 — Hon. Joseph Story, 432.
Ordinations, and Installations, 141, 288, 428.

P.

Paige, L. R., Commentary on New Testament, by, vol. ii., 275.
Parable, a, from Rückert, 332.
Park, E. A., Dudleian Lecture by, 278.
Patrick, Commentary of, 116.
Peabody, A. P., Sermon by, 425—Oration by, ib.
"Perils of the Nation," 63.
Plea for Theology — Lamson's Alumni Address, 289–314—neglect of theology, 290—its causes, 292—element of common sense in Unitarian theology, 293—transcendental views, 294—intuitive truths, 295—necessity and use of theology, ib.—relation to absolute truth, 296—to the wants of the individual mind, ib.—to human science, 298 — historical skepticism, 302--religious questions and philosophy of the age, ib.--critical theology, 303 — no unchanging theology, 304—historical element of theology, 305 — reverence for antiquity, 306—a living, scientific theology necessary to the prosperity of a denomination, 307 — too little done by Unitarians, 308 — Cambridge Divinity School, ib. — requisites to give an impulse to theological studies, 311—influence of theologians, 312—the late Dr. Ware, 313.
Poetical Contributions.—No Heart Alone, 191—Re-translation, 192 —Life, 194 — The Frost, 331 — Funeral Bell, ib. — A Parable, 332—Alexander's Power, 334—Al-Sirat, 335.
Poets and Poetry of Europe, 225—236 — literature of translations, 225—true principle of translation, 228—English and German translations, 229 — plan of Longfellow's volume, 230—historical introductions, 231—Danish poetry, 232 — Swedish, 233 — German, 234—Italian, 235.
Prayer and Conference Meetings, 140.
Psalms and Hymns for the Sanctuary, Collection of, 132.

Q.

Quincy, Pres., Speech of, 261 — Memoir of Grahame, by, 426.

R.

Rationalism. See *White*.
Rejoinder to Reply of H. Mann, 133.
Relation between the Old and New Testaments, 116–129—Commentaries, 116—value of Old Testament, 117—difference in views of God, 120—standard of character, 122—grounds of acceptance, 123—sermon on the mount, ib.—Epistle to the Romans, 124—use of Old Testament, 126 — moral questions, 127.
"Remedies for the Perils of the Nation," 63.
Rights, Claims, and Duties of Opinion, Dewey's Address on, 82--102—right to judge, 83—Christian view, 85 — judgment only opinion, 87—the question of the time, 89—Christian record, ib.—what Christianity is, 90—prejudice against miracle, 93—teaching of nature, 95—spirit in which the question of the day is to be met, 96—ministerial intercourse, 99—importance of opinion, 101.
Robbins, C., Address, and Dedication Sermon by, 425.
Romish Church, 284.
Rose's Translation of Neander, 180—191—defects of, 181—examples of bad translation, 184—English and German languages, 189.

Rückert, F., translations from, 332, 335.
Russell, A. U., Elocutionary Reader, and Introduction to, by, 422.
Russell, B. See *Baylies*.

S.

Saltonstall, L. See *Obituary*.
Schaf, P., on Protestantism, translated by Nevin, noticed 220 — Introduction, ib. — German Transcendentalism, 223 — Prof. Stowe, 224.
Scoresby, W., on American Factories, 275.
Scripture Catechism, 133.
Sectarianism. See *Harvard Coll.*
Sedgewick, E., Moral Tales, by, 134.
Slavery, Clerical Meeting on, 139.
Smith, J., Morison's Life of, 170—180 — political character and labors, 170—personal history, 172 — private life, 177 — religious character, 178.
Social Inequalities, 63—81—condition of England, 63—true idea of civilization, 66—institution of property, 70—uses of wealth, 73 —rights, 75—accumulation, 76—worth of man, 79.
Sparks, J., American Biography by, vol. vi., 273.
Speculative and Practical Wisdom, article on, 337 — 352 — the two extremes of ethical science, 337 — practical systems, 138—naturalism and spiritualism, 339 — teaching of Christ, 341 — complete system, 343—connexion of different parts of our being, 345 — transcendentalism, 347 — independent conviction, 349—reason, 350—correct method, 351.
Spooner, L., Unconstitutionality of Slavery by, 426.
Stiles, Pres., Life of, 273.
Stone, J. S. See *Griswold*.
Story, J. See *Obituary*.
Strauss, Life of Jesus, article on, 145—169—mythic theory, 146—Rationalists, 147—Strauss's view, 149—account of Jesus, 151—resurrection, 152 — theory of Paulus, 153 — theory of Strauss, 154—Gospel of John, 157—effect of mythic interpretation, 159—difficulties of, 161 — Beard's Voices of the Church, 167.
Sumner, C., Oration by, 407—417 — character of Fourth of July Orations, 407—popular eloquence of Greece, 408—causes of alarm, 409—subject of Oration well chosen, 410—war described by military men, 411—propriety of free discussion, 412—character of oration, ib.—style, 413—analysis of oration, 414 — Peace Establishments, 415.
Sunday School Society, 138.

T.

Testaments, Old and New. See *Relation*.
Theology, a living, scientific, needed. See *Plea*.
Thom, J. H. See *White*.

V.

Vinet, A., Vital Christianity, by, 130.

W.

Ward, S. G., Essays on Art translated by, 314.
Ware, H., death of noticed, 313.
Weiss, J., Discourse by, 278.
Whitby, Commentary of, 116.
Wilson, J. H., on Satan, 277.
White, Blanco, Life of, by Thom, 195—character and opinions, 196 —foundation of our belief in God discussed, 197 — intuition and revelation, ib.—proof from design, 198 — Socratic statement, 199—pantheism, 201 — miracles, 203—place they hold in Christianity, 204 — mission of Christ, 206 — proof of miracle, 207 — causes of skepticism, 210—reasonableness of miracle, 211 — Blanco White's unbelief, 213—his views of the N. T., 215—of prayer, 218—his death, 219—tendency of his opinions, ib.—Second article on, 352—364—personal history, 352—early education, 353—extract on the tendency of confession, 355—college life, 357—change of opinions, ib. — rejection of Romanism and Christianity, 358 — connexion with the English Church, 359—religious difficulties, 360 — conversion to Unitarianism, 361—further change of opinion, 362—love of truth, ib.—mental endowments, 363—character, ib.

LATE UNITARIAN PUBLICATIONS.

LIST No. 1.

		Price
BURNAP.	—EXPOSITORY LECTURES ON THE PRINCIPAL PASSAGES OF THE SCRIPTURES WHICH RELATE TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. By George W. Burnap, Pastor of the First Independent Church of Baltimore. *Boston.* 12*mo.*, *pp.* 336.	1 00
————	MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS OF GEORGE W. BURNAP, collected and revised by the Author. *Baltimore.* 12*mo.*, *pp.* 343.	87½
CHANNING.	—THE WORKS OF WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D. Fourth complete edition, with an Introduction. *Boston.* 6 *vols.* 12*mo.*	4 00
DANA.	—LETTERS ADDRESSED TO RELATIVES AND FRIENDS, chiefly in reply to arguments in support of the Doctrine of the Trinity. By Mary S. B. Dana, Author of "The Southern and Northern Harps," "The Parted Family," &c. *Boston.* 12*mo.*, *pp.* 318.	0 75
DEWEY.	—THE WORKS OF REV. ORVILLE DEWEY, D. D. Pastor of the Church of the Messiah, New York. Complete in one volume. *London.* 8*vo.*, *pp.* 887.	3 50
ELLIS.	—A DISCOURSE delivered at the Dedication of the First Meeting-House of the First Church and Society in Somerville, Mass., on Wednesday, Sept. 3, 1845. By George E. Ellis, Pastor of the Harvard Church, Charlestown. *Boston.* 8*vo.*, *pp.* 24.	12½
FURNESS.	—DOMESTIC WORSHIP. By William H. Furness, Pastor of the First Congregational Unitarian Church in Philadelphia. Third edition. *Boston.* 12*mo.* *pp.* 272.	0 75
FROTHINGHAM.	—DEISM OR CHRISTIANITY? Four Discourses, by N. L. Frothingham, Minister of the First Church. *Boston.* 8*vo.*, *pp.* 77.	0 25
GANNETT.	—THE FAITH OF THE UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN EXPLAINED, JUSTIFIED AND DISTINGUISHED. A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the Unitarian Church, Montreal, on Sunday, May 11, 1845. By Ezra S. Gannett, Minister of the Federal Street Church, Boston. Published by request. *Boston.* 8*vo.*, *pp* 40.	12½
PEABODY.	—ANTI-SUPERNATURALISM. A Sermon delivered before the Senior Class of the Divinity School in Harvard University, July 13, 1845. *Cambridge.* 8*vo.*, *pp.* 26.	0 17
TAYLER.	—RETROSPECT OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND: or, The Church, Puritanism, and Free Inquiry. By John James Tayler, B. A. *London.* 8*vo.*, *pp.* 563.	2 75

Price

WATERSTON. — THOUGHTS ON MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CULTURE. By R. C. Waterston. Second edition, revised. *Boston.* 16*mo.*, *pp.* 302. 62½

WELLS. — PRACTICAL DISCOURSES. By George Wadsworth Wells, late Pastor of the Unitarian Church in Groton. With a Memoir. *Boston.* 16*mo.*, *pp.* 290. 0 50

The above works may be had of the subscribers at the prices annexed. We also furnish any Unitarian publications at the lowest prices.

Orders from any part of the United States promptly answered.

CROSBY & NICHOLS, Boston.

New Hymn Book.

CHRISTIAN HYMNS;

FOR

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE WORSHIP.

Compiled by a Committee of the Cheshire Pastoral Association.

☞ The subscribers have just published a new Hymn Book, prepared expressly to meet the wants of the societies of our denomination. The compilers have endeavored to prepare a more lyrical collection than most of those now in use — better adapted for singing, and containing a greater variety of metres. They have sought to make the book what the present state of our churches and societies demands, and have consulted, for that purpose, not only different clergymen, but leaders of choirs, and many other persons of taste and judgment.

This collection contains a much larger number and greater variety of Hymns than any that has been published for our societies, and is sold at a very low price.

☞ An edition of the "Christian Hymns," on larger type, is in press, and will be published in November.

The following Societies have already introduced the "Christian Hymns" into their churches:—

Broadway Society, - - - -	South Boston, Mass.
Rev. Mr. Stearns's, - - - -	Hingham, "
" " Leonard's, - - - -	Dublin, N. H.
" " Livermore's, - - - -	Keene, "
" " Cutler's, - - - -	Peterboro', "
" " Whitwell's, - - - -	Wilton, "

Rev. Mr. Coe's, - - - - -	East Medway,	Mass.
" " Palfrey's - - - -	Barnstable,	"
——— Chapel, - - - -	Taunton,	"
——— ———, - - - -	Hopkinton,	"
——— ———, - - - -	Pomfret,	Vt.

As an evidence of the estimation in which the 'Christian Hymns' is held, we are permitted to give the following

Extract from a letter by Rev. Dr. Francis, of Cambridge.

"I have looked through the book with great satisfaction; and I feel that our community are under much obligation to 'the Committee of the Cheshire Pastoral Association' for this very valuable contribution to the beauty and interest of public worship. I find in your collection many hymns that are new to me, and — what I should hardly have expected — are likewise among the best that I have ever seen. The selection is made with great good taste, and with a judgment that happily provides some fitting strain of sacred poetry for every occasion and subject. The number of hymns is large, but I think none too large; and it is surprising how few poor ones there are among so many."

NOTICES OF THE "CHRISTIAN HYMNS."

From the Christian World.

"This work is the product of much labor. The compilers, Rev. Messrs. Livermore, of Keene, Cutler, of Peterboro', Leonard, of Dublin, and Whitwell, of Wilton, have availed themselves of the numerous collections of Psalm and Hymn Books, of all denominations, that have appeared in this country and in Europe through the ages that have passed, and have systematically arranged the selections, with reference to the convenience of the clergy; so that the subject of the sermon and the hymns that precede and follow it, may be in unison. A friend of ours, conversant with the present wants of our churches, in respect to psalms and hymns, and who has examined the collection we are noticing, with a great deal of care, has begged us to recommend it to all who may be in want of a book eminently adapted to congregational music. Its variety of topics and metres is wonderful; — and there is a glow and unction in the poetry, that cannot fail of kindling the holiest feelings. There are in the collection NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHT HYMNS. The quality of the typography, paper and binding is very good considering the price, which is only fifty cents.

"The book was commenced with no other design, than to meet a want felt to exist in the 'Cheshire Pastoral Association.' Since its completion, other and more distant societies have expressed so strong a desire to introduce it, that the proprietors and publishers have made arrangements to meet any applications that may be made for it."

From the Christian Register.

"Instead of indicating ourselves the peculiar excellences of this book, we insert the following communication from a high authority:

"Without comparing this collection of hymns with any other, it has certain obvious merits which are peculiar to itself.

"1. The New York and Springfield Collections contain but little over 500 hymns each; Greenwood's Collection, 600; the Christian Psalter, 700; whereas this Collection contains over 900.

"2. The selection seems to be made with great good taste. We miss very few of those that we have been accustomed to value; and on the other hand, we find a large number of beautiful pieces added, which are in no other similar work. A large part of our hymns were written by persons who had no pretensions to poetry and at a time when poetry itself seemed dead. During the last fifty years, as important additions have been made to devotional poetry as to any department of poetical literature, and the Cheshire compilers have done wisely in drawing largely on modern writers.

"3. The book, though containing so many more hymns, by being printed more compactly and with a somewhat smaller type, (though of ample size for all practical uses,) does not make so large a volume as most of our other collections and is sold at a cheaper price.

"4. It contains a more than ordinary number of hymns suited to the various occasions, on which Christian worshippers are drawn together.

"5. And, what is a very material point, four different persons have been engaged in the compilation. An individual, if he select those hymns only which are suited to his taste, will make a very meagre selection; and if, to fill up a volume, he add others without any personal feeling of their beauty, he is almost as likely to choose the poor as the good. This difficulty is in a great measure obviated by increasing the number of those employed in making the selection. The book being prepared by various minds and representing various tastes, will probably meet a larger and more varied circle of wants.

"The multiplication of hymn books is attended with some inconveniences; but, that it has very great advantages is obvious, when we compare some of those lately published, with the meagre and poor Collections in use fifteen or twenty years ago. Each new book brings to light some new treasures, while the poorer hymns are gradually winnowed out.

"There may frequently be reasons for preferring other books; but we would recommend to Societies who wish for a new hymn book to examine this; confident, that if they select it, they will have no reason to regret their choice."

Societies about furnishing themselves with Hymn Books are requested to send to us for copies of the above for examination.

CROSBY & NICHOLS, PUBLISHERS,

118 Washington Street.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

No. CXXXII.

FOURTH SERIES—No. XII.

NOVEMBER, 1845.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CROSBY.

NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO.

LONDON: JOHN CHAPMAN, 121 NEWGATE STREET.

1845.

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

Rev. ALVAN LAMSON, of Dedham, - - - - - - }
Rev. EZRA S. GANNETT, of Boston, - - - - - - } *Editors.*

CROSBY & NICHOLS,
PUBLISHERS, BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,
118 WASHINGTON STREET,
BOSTON.

C. & N. have for sale a good collection of Miscellaneous Books, comprising as large a variety as is usually found. All new publications received as soon as issued, and sold at the most reasonable prices.

Having on hand a very large variety of Juvenile Books, and constantly receiving all that are published, they will pay particular attention to furnishing Juvenile and Sabbath School Libraries. Books will be sent at any time for examination, and those not found suitable may be returned.

☞ Books imported to order by every steamer.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY CROSBY & NICHOLS.

DOMESTIC WORSHIP. By Rev. Wm. H. Furness. Third edition. 8vo., cloth, 0 75

THOUGHTS ON MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CULTURE. By Rev. R. C. Waterston. Second edition. 16mo., cloth, 0 67

THE YOUNG MAIDEN. By Rev. A. B. Muzzey. Sixth edition. 16mo., gilt cloth, 0 63

MAN A SOUL; or, The Inward and the Experimental Evidences of Christianity. By Rev. A. B. Muzzey, 0 50

LIFE IN THE SICK-ROOM. Essays, by Harriet Martineau. With a Preface by Mrs. Follen. Second edition, 0 67

WELLS'S SERMONS. Practical Discourses. By George Wadsworth Wells. 16mo., cloth, 0 50

A PRESENT FROM A PASTOR TO HIS YOUNG PARISHIONERS. In ten Discourses, urging upon them an early and earnest attention to Religion, 0 63

THE CHRISTIAN PATRIARCH. A Memoir of Deacon John Whitman. By Rev. Jason Whitman, 0 38

A PARAPHRASE ON THE LORD'S PRAYER, with an Introduction on the Nature of Prayer. Written and printed by some of the Pupils in the West-of-England Institution for the Deaf and Dumb. With a Preface by Miss D. L. Dix. 32mo., gilt cloth, 0 20

MRS. FOLLEN'S POEMS. Poems by Mrs. E. L. Follen, author of "Married Life," &c. &c. 16mo., cloth, 0 50

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL SERVICE BOOK. By Hon. Stephen C. Phillips, President of the Boston Sunday School Society. In Three Parts. 18mo., half morocco, per doz. 4 00

PART FIRST.—Devotional Exercises and Prayers for the School. Paper, per doz. 1 50

PART SECOND.—Hymns for the School. Half cloth, per doz. 2 00

PART THIRD.—Prayers and Hymns for Teachers' Meetings. Paper, per doz. 1 50

PARTS FIRST AND SECOND, bound together, in half morocco, per doz. 3 00

HYMNS AND TUNES FOR VESTRY AND CONFERENCE MEETINGS. By Edwin M. Stone. Square 16mo., per doz. 2 00

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL SINGING BOOK; being a Collection of Hymns with appropriate Music, designed as a Guide and Assistant to the Devotional Exercises of Sabbath Schools and Families. Square 16mo., per doz. 2 50

I WILL BE A GENTLEMAN. A Book for Boys. By Mrs. Tuthill. Second edition. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 37

I WILL BE A LADY. A Book for Girls. By Mrs. Tuthill, author of "I will be a Gentleman," &c. &c. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

STORIES FOR CHILDREN. Intended as Hints to Parents. By Mrs. R. J. Cleveland. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 42

THE BIRTHDAY. A Sequel to the "Well Spent Hour." By Mrs. Follen, author of "Married Life," &c. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

TIMES OF THE SAVIOUR; or, Traditions of Palestine. By Harriet Martineau. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

A VISIT TO THE COUNTRY. By Miss Cabot, author of "The Happy Valley," &c. &c. 18mo., cloth, 0 34

GENEVIEVE AND MARCELIN, and other Tales. Translated from the French 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 45

PERSEVERE AND YOU MUST SUCCEED; or the History of Mary Smith. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 34

LITTLE STORIES FOR LITTLE PEOPLE. 18mo., cloth, 0 20

SKETCHES FROM THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By Mrs. Cheney, author of "A Peep at the Pilgrims," &c. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL PRESENT. From the Port Folio of an Ex-Superintendent. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

SUNDAY SCHOOL CONVERSATIONS on some of the interesting subjects recorded in the New Testament. 18mo., gilt cloth, 0 38

A DAY IN THE WOODLANDS, and Ellen of the Mountains. By Miss Caroline F. Orne. 18mo., paper, 0 10

ELLA HERBERT; or Self-Denial. By a Lady. 18mo., gilt cloth.

THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST. Third edition, revised. By T. B. Fox.

SCRIPTURE LESSONS AND ALLEGORIES. By T. B. Fox.

FIVE YEARS OF YOUTH. By Harriet Martineau. Second American edition, with an Introduction by Mrs. Follen.

LESSONS WITHOUT BOOKS. By Mrs. Sedgwick.

LOUISA AND HER COUSINS. By Mrs. Sedgwick.

HEBREW TALES.

THE RACE OF IMPROVEMENT. A new Game, designed for the amusement and instruction of children. By the author of "The Improved Game of Dr. Busby," 1 00

THE STRIFE OF GENIUS. An amusing Game for Young People. By Mrs. L. C. Tuthill, author of "The Young Ladies' Home," &c. 0 50